




Anuario de Psicología Jurídica 2025

<https://journals.copmadrid.org/apj>



Measuring Attitudes toward Open Adoption: Spanish Validation of the Open Adoption Scale

Ana Berástegui¹, Jesús Oliver¹, Susana Corral², Carles Perez-Testor³, Irene Calvo⁴, Judith Lorente-De-Sanz³, Mireia Sanz⁵, and Scott D. Ryan⁶

¹Comillas Pontifical University, Madrid, Spain; ²Deusto University, Bilbao, Spain; ³Ramon Llull University, Barcelona, Spain;

⁴University Polyclinic CEU San Pablo, Madrid, Spain; ⁵Begoñako Andra Mari Teacher Training University College, BAM, in partnership and accredited by the University of Deusto, Spain; ⁶The University of Texas at Arlington, FL, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 4 June 2023
Accepted 22 May 2024

Keywords:
Attitudes
Open Adoption
Adoptive family
Biological family
Validation

ABSTRACT

Background: Open adoption is a kind of adoption in which some degree of communication is formalized between the biological family and the adopted child or adoptive family. The present study analyzes the psychometric properties of the Spanish adaptation of the Open Adoption Scale, an instrument that assesses various negative attitudes toward open adoption. *Method:* The study involved 440 participants of both sexes who completed a sociodemographic questionnaire and the Open Adoption Scale. An exploratory factor analysis was performed with half of the sample and a confirmatory factor analysis with the other half. *Results:* High internal consistency indices were observed. Furthermore, an exploratory factor analysis and a confirmatory factor analysis supported construct validity. Finally, the strong relationships observed between the scale and four myths about the absence of benefits of open adoption supported convergent validity. *Conclusions:* The results support using the Spanish version to assess attitudes toward open adoption. Assessing attitudes toward open adoption is essential to implementing it, selecting candidates, and evaluating training processes for technicians and families.

La medición de la actitud hacia la adopción abierta: validación española de la Escala de Adopción Abierta

RESUMEN

Antecedentes: La adopción abierta es una forma de adopción en la que se formaliza algún grado de comunicación entre la familia biológica y el niño o niña adoptado o la familia adoptante. El presente estudio analiza las propiedades psicométricas de la adaptación española de la Open Adoption Scale, un instrumento que evalúa diversas actitudes negativas hacia la adopción abierta. *Método:* En el estudio participaron 440 participantes de ambos sexos, que cumplimentaron un cuestionario sociodemográfico y la Open Adoption Scale. Se llevó a cabo un análisis factorial exploratorio con la mitad de la muestra y un análisis factorial confirmatorio con la otra mitad. *Resultados:* Se observaron unos índices de consistencia interna elevados. Asimismo, un análisis factorial exploratorio y un análisis factorial confirmatorio avalaron la validez de constructo. Finalmente, las fuertes relaciones observadas entre la escala y cuatro mitos sobre la ausencia de beneficios en la adopción abierta avalaron la validez convergente. *Conclusiones:* Los resultados avalan el uso de la versión española para evaluar las actitudes hacia la adopción abierta. La evaluación de las actitudes hacia la adopción abierta resulta esencial para su implementación, la selección de los candidatos y la evaluación de los procesos de formación de los técnicos y las familias.

Open adoption is a form of adoption characterized by the arrangement of some degree of communication or contact between the biological family and the adopted child or the adoptive family (Berástegui, 2016; Grotevant, 2000). It has also been labeled

inclusive adoption or contact adoption. Open adoptions are very heterogeneous regarding the type, level, and frequency of contact, the people involved, or the degree and mode of formalization. The degree of communication varies from a simple exchange of non-

Cite this article as: Berástegui, A., Oliver, J., Corral, S., Perez-Testor, C., Calvo, I., Lorente-De-Sanz, J., Sanz, M., & Ryan, S. D. (2025). Measuring attitudes toward open adoption: Spanish validation of the Open Adoption Scale. *Anuario de Psicología Jurídica*, 35, 43-51. <https://doi.org/10.5093/apj2025a3>

Correspondence: jopec@comillas.edu (J. Oliver).

ISSN: 1133-0740/© 2025 Colegio Oficial de la Psicología de Madrid. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

anonymous information (semi-open adoptions) to the regular schedule of meetings (fully open adoptions) (Hass, 2015; ISS/CIR, 2015). In addition, this contact can be maintained with different members of the family of origin (biological parents, grandparents, aunts/uncles, or siblings).

Open adoption has been used since the 90s in countries, such as the USA, Great Britain, Germany, Austria, Canada, or New Zealand. In Spain, open adoption has been possible since Ley 26/2015 [Law 26/2015] on the Protection of Children and Adolescents entered into force. Under this law, open adoption is formalized judicially (Diez, 2018) and can be structured as the initial provision for a child or as a way to ensure permanency in previous family foster arrangements. Moreover, it primarily aims to maintain sibling connections when a permanent family placement in the same household has not been secured (Adroher et al., 2023). However, its initial implementation has been slow and uneven and, to date, has not been evaluated (Adroher et al., 2023; Diez, 2018; Martin, 2020).

The development of open adoption in Spain has clashed with the traditional vision of the family and a culture of closed adoption, which considers essential strict respect for confidentiality in the adoptive triad and the rupture of all ties with the family of origin (Rosser & Berástegui, 2017). Closed adoption is based on the belief that secrecy is necessary to protect the child in adoption and helps triad members to heal and move on with their lives. In contrast, openness is presumed to force the child to have dual loyalties, leads to confusion, and will inevitably create competition between the adoptive and birth families, interfering with attachment in the adoptive family (Ryan et al., 2011).

This traditional view is part of cultural beliefs about open adoption and can interact with the professional discourses and adoptive projects of families offering to adopt. Although Spanish professionals have expressed positive attitudes toward open adoption, they warn of some barriers for the families and the professionals themselves (Rosser & Berástegui, 2017). In a recent study, Corral et al. (in press) interviewed 22 adoption professionals who highlighted their crucial role in supporting adoptive families in open adoption. Although the professionals acknowledge that open adoption is beneficial, they stated that its implementation is challenging and face significant cultural, technical, and administrative difficulties. They concluded that, although open adoption is increasingly accepted, its implementation requires a mindset change.

In contrast with these beliefs, international literature consistently highlights the positive impact of open adoptions on all members of the adoptive triad, especially children, whose best interests should be the primary consideration of decision-making in adoption (Smith et al., 2020). Research has found a positive effect of open adoption on children's well-being and psychological adjustment (del Pozo de Bolger et al., 2021; Grotevant et al., 2017; Siegel, 2013; Wolfgram, 2008). In a recent systematic review, Smith et al. (2020) report that open adoption promotes more open communication about adoption and origins in the adoptive family, and a better development of children's adoptive identity, fostering self-esteem and decreasing their possible feelings of guilt, sadness, and abandonment in the adoption process. It also fosters a better parent-child attachment (Lo & Grotevant, 2020), allowing the children to expand their circle of support, maintaining their link to two families, and conflict of loyalties in the children (Smith et al., 2020). On the other hand, contact with members of their biological families is not related to greater difficulties of adaptation or to the desire to return to their biological family (Smith et al., 2020). In this sense, research has found some benefits for families and the relationship between them, such as the reduction of anxiety and insecurity, a more empathetic and realistic view of the biological parents, and an increase in communication about adoption in the adoptive parents with their children, or the reduction of anxiety, fears, and the grieving process of the biological mothers (Brodzinsky, 2005; McSherry et al., 2008; Neil, 2004; Smith & Logan, 2004).

Some risks are also indicated, especially in cases of previous family abuse or when the family of origin is reluctant to adoption. It should be noted that most of the research on open adoption has been developed in private adoptions and not in adoptions from care (Faulkner & Madden, 2012; Frasch et al., 2000; Ward et al., 2022), which are more similar to adoptions in European countries and, more specifically, in the Spanish system (Adroher et al., 2023; Berástegui, 2016; Gómez, 2018).

Assessing Attitudes toward Open Adoption

Although the myths underpinning closed adoption have been refuted by international research, the attitude toward open adoption has a major impact on its development and outcomes (Brown et al., 2007). Technicians' negative attitudes are related to a lower tendency to propose and promote this type of adoption, considering that they are not usually in the child's best interests or showing a greater tendency to suspend contacts (Robinson, 2017; Sobol et al., 2004). Similarly, families' negative attitudes can lead to a closer adoption project, lower willingness toward this type of adoption, less suitability for open adoption, and a negative interpretation of the challenges that contact may involve (Sorek et al., 2020). A study shows greater resistance among families than professionals when promoting openness and more open attitudes in more experienced and trained technicians (Ryan et al., 2011). Hence, assessing cultural beliefs or adherence to myths about openness is essential in designing and supporting this measure (Berástegui, 2016; Brown et al., 2007).

The Open Adoption Scale (OAS; Brown et al., 2007) evaluates the myths or negative beliefs about open adoption concerning the three vertices or protagonists of the adoptive triad (biological family, adoptive family, and adopted minor), such that a low score would indicate a more positive attitude toward open adoption. These myths were originally drawn from a literature review and followed a content validity process. This questionnaire differs from other questionnaires aimed at assessing open communication within the adoptive family, such as the Origins and Differences Communication Scale (Berástegui, 2005; Berástegui & Jódar, 2013) or the Adoption Communication Scale (ACS; Aramburu et al., 2015; Brodzinsky, 2006; Grotevant et al., 2009), as it addresses the attitude toward open adoption structurally. It was initially designed as a training and research tool to inform child welfare personnel and policymakers of the influence of adoption-related myths on child welfare adoption practice (Brown et al., 2007).

In the Spanish-speaking context, validating this measure can be very useful. First, previous research has underlined the importance of considering the cultural dimension when planning and implementing open adoption (Ryan et al., 2011). Having a tool in Spanish to investigate social attitudes toward this form of adoption can help accompany this measure's implementation in Spain and be a starting point to evaluate its reception in other Spanish-speaking contexts. In addition, it can be used to evaluate future families' specific attitudes in their selection, recruitment, and evaluation processes. Not least, such a measure can help assess the change in the adoptive family's pre-preparation processes (Ryan et al., 2011) and the training of professionals and teams (Siegel, 2013), which are success factors of open adoption. Therefore, this research aims to validate the Spanish version of the Open Adoption Scale (OAS).

Method

Participants

Convenience and snowball sampling were used to recruit participants. To carry out a factor analysis, Nunnally (1994), and Bentler and Chou (1987) recommended using a sample 10 times larger than the number of the items of the scale, so an attempt was made to get a large enough sample to meet this requirement.

The total sample consisted of 440 participants, 75.7% women ($n = 333$) and 24.3% men ($n = 107$). Ages ranged from 18 to 71 years, with a mean age of 30.6 ($SD = 11.79$). Most of the participants reported having university studies (96.8%), and not living as a couple (69.4%) or having children (75.2%). Table 1 shows these and other socio-demographic characteristics of the participants.

Using the SPSS procedure of creating random samples of 50% of cases, participants were divided into two groups to perform an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with Group 1 ($n = 220$) and a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with Group 2 ($n = 220$).

Table 1. Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	30.55	11.79
	<i>n</i>	%
Sex		
Female	333	75.7%
Male	107	24.3%
Living as a couple or married		
No	304	69.4%
Yes	134	30.6%
Has children		
No	331	75.2%
Yes	109	24.8%
Educational level		
University studies	426	96.8%
Vocational training	6	1.4%
Secondary studies	7	1.6%
Primary studies	1	0.2%
I know an international adoptee		
Yes	346	78.6%
No	94	21.4%
I know a national adoptee		
Yes	230	47.6%
No	209	52.4%
I know a foster child		
Yes	276	62.7%
No	164	37.3%
I am fostered/adopted		
No	409	93.0%
Foster	18	4.1%
National adopted	9	2.0%
International adopted	4	0.9%
Mother/father of fostered/adopted child		
No		
Of fostered child	393	89.3%
Of national adoptee	26	5.9%
Of international adoptee	6	1.4%
	15	3.4%
Sibling of fostered/adopted child		
No	412	93.6%
Of fostered child	20	4.5%
Of national adoptee	4	0.9%
Of international adoptee	3	0.7%
Relative of fostered/adopted child		
No	352	80.0%
Of fostered child	12	2.7%
Of national adoptee	36	8.2%
Of international adoptee	40	9.1%

Instruments

Sociodemographic Questionnaire

This questionnaire, prepared for the present study, included sociodemographic characteristics (sex, age, educational level, couple status and years of cohabitation, presence or absence of children and their number). In addition, to examine convergent validity, as no

other scales have been found to assess myths about open adoption, four items of negative attitudes toward open adoption were included within the adoptive triad. They were as follows: 1) No good will come from biological parents keeping in touch with the adoptive family; 2) No good will come from biological parents keeping in touch with their children when they are adopted by other families; 3) No good will come from the adopted child having contact with their biological family; 4) No good will come from adoptive parents having contact with the biological family of the adopted child. Participants had to rate their level of agreement on these four items from 1 (*very low*) to 10 (*very high*).

Open Adoption Scale (OAS)

This scale, developed by Brown et al. (2007), assesses the level of agreement with various myths about open adoption in adults. It consists of 15 items with 6 response options ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). The scale has three subscales of 5 items each, reflecting myths associated with each member of the adoptive triad: the adopted child, the adoptive parents, and the biological parents.

The internal consistency indices (Cronbach alpha) of the original scale and subscales were high: Global OAS = .92, Biological Parents = .85, Adopted Child = .89, and Adoptive Parents = .82.

In the original validation, construct validity was checked by multiple-group CFA (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Regarding the evidence of convergent validity, significant associations were found between the OAS and several items on beliefs about open adoptions. Finally, concurrent validity was verified by observing that social workers had fewer myths about open adoption than students in other disciplines (Brown et al., 2007).

Procedure

We obtained the consent of one of the main authors of the original version, to proceed with the adaptation of this instrument. The current team carried out the first translation from English to Spanish. Two native Spanish speakers with a C2 English level and expertise in child protection, but not research team members, reviewed the translation and back-translated refining the translation with minor changes.

The questionnaire was designed in a physical and an online version through the Sphinx data collection software. The online version of the questionnaire was first completed by two volunteers to guarantee an easy understanding of the instructions, the items, and the requested response method, as well as the correct functioning of the survey tool.

The final version was distributed in its digital version through the database of the research center, which includes participants in other studies and those interested in family childhood issues. It was also sent through digital platforms to reach the largest number of students from various universities through a snowball sampling. In addition, the physical questionnaire was distributed among different groups of students at the University in which the study was carried out.

The Ethics Committee of the Comillas Pontifical University of Madrid approved the study and the data collection followed the principles of research ethics, although it is a voluntary, anonymized study that does not involve intervention or foresee discomfort for the participants.

Data Analysis

First, a maximum likelihood EFA with Oblimin rotation was carried out with Group 1. To determine the number of factors to be extracted, a parallel analysis and a minimum average partial test (Horn, 1965; Velicer, 1976) were carried out. Factors with more than two items and items with loads greater than .40 were considered (Izquierdo et al.,

2014; Schmitt, 2011). Secondly, a CFA was conducted with Group 2. The fit indices used were the chi-square statistic, the ratio between chi-square and degrees of freedom (χ^2/df), the comparative fit index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). The cut-off criterion for the ratio of χ^2/df is ≤ 3 ; for CFI and TLI, it is $\geq .90$; for RMSEA, it is $\leq .06$; and for SRMR, it is $< .08$ (Bentler, 1990; Bentler & Bonett, 1980; Brown, 2015).

Next, the internal consistency of the scale and its subscales was calculated using Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega. Likewise, after checking that all the quantitative variables were normally distributed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test with Lilliefors correction and the analysis of skewness and kurtosis (Curran et al., 1996), several Pearson correlations were calculated to examine the relationship between the scale and its subscales with the four items of negative attitudes toward open adoption. SPSS v.28 was used to perform parallel analysis and EFA, as well as to calculate reliability and correlations; the free software JAMOVI (version 2.3.18; The Jamovi project, 2022), which provides an interface of the R program (Sesé, 2023), was used to perform CFA.

Results

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Firstly, after performing a parallel analysis and a minimum average partial test with Group 1, we determined the adequacy of extracting two factors. Next, EFA was performed with the

maximum likelihood method and Oblimin rotation. Nine items loaded on the first factor, related to the myths about the adoptive family (about the adopted child and the adoptive parents). Five items loaded on the second factor, associated with the myths about biological parents. Item AP.4 did not reach a loading of .40 in any of the factors, so it was eliminated, thus retaining 14 of the original 15 items (see Appendix A and B). Table 2 shows the loadings of these 14 items.

Concerning the internal consistency indices, the Open Adoption Scale-Spanish (OAS-S) and its subscales obtained high values of Cronbach's alpha (OAS-S total = .90, AF = .90, BP = .85) and McDonald's omega (OAS-S total = .91, AF = .90, BP = .86).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Before performing the CFA, the multivariate normality of the fourteen OAS items retained in the EFA was analyzed. The Mardia test suggested that the multivariate distribution was asymmetric (Mardia skewness = 945.85, $p < .0001$) and leptokurtic (Mardia kurtosis = 8.51, $p < .0001$) and, therefore, neither the skewness nor the kurtosis were normal multivariate. The results of the Anderson-Darling test for the univariate tests of each of the 14 items showed that none of them was strictly normal at the univariate level. The CFA was specified using an estimator for ordinal variables, the Diagonal Weighted Least Squares (DWLS), and a two-factor structure.

The model results showed an appropriate fit, with a significant χ^2 -value ($\chi^2 = 140$, $df = 74$, $p < .001$, $\chi^2/df = 1.89$), an RMSEA value of .06 (confidence interval [.05, .08]), an SRMR of .06, a CFI of .99, and

Table 2. Items of the Open Adoption Scale and Factor Loadings (Rotation Method: Oblimin)

Items	Factors	
	AF	BP
AC.5 Es mejor para los adoptados empezar de nuevo, sin ningún contacto con sus padres biológicos [Adoptees should start over without any contact with their biological parents].	.84	.09
AP.3 Para desarrollar una identidad familiar fuerte, los padres adoptivos necesitan una adopción cerrada [To develop a strong family identity, adoptive parents need closed adoption].	.84	.03
AC.4 Los niños que son adoptados vivirán confusos si continúan viendo a sus padres biológicos [Adopted children will be confused if they continue to see their biological parents].	.82	.03
AC.3 Los niños formarán un mejor apego a su familia adoptiva si no tienen contacto con su familia biológica [Children will form a better attachment to their adoptive family if they have no contact with their biological family].	.79	.13
AP.2 Los padres adoptivos se sentirán menos legitimados en el rol de padres si el niño sigue teniendo contacto con su familia biológica [Adoptive parents will feel less legitimized in their role as parents if the child continues to have contact with their biological family].	.74	-.10
AP.1 Los padres adoptivos no adoptarían niños si tuvieran que tener trato con la familia biológica del niño [Adoptive parents would not adopt children if they had to deal with the child's biological family].	.57	.06
AC.2 El sentimiento de pertenencia del niño a la familia adoptiva se hace más fuerte cuando se corta el contacto con la familia biológica [The child's sense of belonging to the adoptive family becomes stronger when contact with the biological family is severed].	.56	.07
AP.5 Sería imposible reclutar a padres adoptivos si pensaran que tienen que lidiar con la familia biológica [It would be impossible to recruit adoptive parents if they thought they had to deal with the biological family].	.51	-.05
AC.1 Los niños se vincularán mejor con sus padres adoptivos si no tienen contacto con su familia biológica [Children will bond better with their adoptive parents if they have no contact with their biological family].	.50	.08
AP.4 La vinculación de los padres adoptivos a su nuevo hijo adoptado se fortalecerá si no hay miedo al contacto con los padres biológicos del niño [The adoptive parents' attachment to their newly adopted child will be strengthened if there is no fear of contact with the child's biological parents].	.16	.04
BP.5 Los padres biológicos que son negligentes con sus niños hasta perder su tutela no tienen nada positivo que ofrecer a sus hijos [Biological parents who neglect their children until they lose their guardianship have nothing positive to offer them].	-.03	.91
BP.4 Los padres biológicos a los que la Administración retira a los niños por maltrato no se merecen poder verlos [Biological parents whose children are removed by the Administration for abuse do not deserve to see them].	-.09	.89
BP.2 No se puede confiar en que los padres biológicos que anteponen las drogas a las necesidades de sus hijos vayan a poner alguna vez a sus hijos por delante [Biological parents who put drugs before their children's needs can never be trusted to put their children first].	.04	.70
BP.3 Los padres biológicos que maltratan a sus hijos hasta perder su tutela no tienen nada positivo que ofrecer a sus hijos [Biological parents who abuse their children until they lose their guardianship have nothing positive to offer them].	.03	.52
BP.1 Los padres biológicos que han perdido la custodia de sus niños porque están en prisión no deberían tener contacto con sus hijos biológicos [Biological parents who have lost custody of their children because they are in prison should not have contact with their biological children].	.21	.51

Note. AF = myths about the adoptive family (about adopted children and adoptive parents); BP = myths about biological parents.

a TLI of .99. Figure 1 shows the 2-factor model with its factor loads.




Figure 1. Factorial Structure of OAS-S.
Note. PB = biological parents; AF = adoptive family.

Convergent Validity

We also found that the Open Adoption Scale-Spanish (OAS-S) and its subscales were positively and strongly related to the four myths about the absence of benefits of open adoption for each member of the adoptive triad (see Table 3). In addition, we observed that the items referring to the absence of benefits for adoptive parents, adopted children, and the adoptive family had stronger relationships with the Adoptive Family subscale than with the Biological Parents subscale.

Discussion

Open adoption has positively impacted all members of the adoptive triad (Smith et al., 2020; Wolfgram, 2008). However, both in the international and national literature, positive and negative attitudes toward open adoption are reported by professionals in the world of adoption (Corral et al., in press; Rosser & Berástegui, 2017; Ryan et al., 2011). It is important to know the professionals' attitudes because they can contribute significantly to a successful adoption process (Berástegui, 2016). The objective of this study was to adapt the Open Adoption Scale (Brown et al., 2007) to the Spanish language to have a validated instrument to explore attitudes toward open adoption. The EFA revealed that the 14-item Open Adoption Spanish (OAS-S) has a two-factor structure. The first factor contained the items related to the adoptive family (e.g., the adopted children and the adoptive parents). The second factor comprised the items related to the biological parents. The CFA supported the existence

of this structure, with adequate fit indices. This structure contrasts with the theoretical structure of the questionnaire as proposed by the original authors, which includes three blocks associated with the three protagonists of the adoptive triad (Brown et al., 2007). However, the two-factor structure proposed for the Spanish version is consistent with that observed by Brown et al. (2007): the Adopted Child and Adoptive Parents scales would be included in the Adoptive Family scale, and the Biological Parents scale would remain similar to the original proposal of the instrument. This two-factor structure can be due to sampling limitations in both versions or a cultural artifact, resulting from the identification between child and adoptive family needs and views and the difficulty of differentiating these two perspectives in the general population. Both versions could benefit from further examination with actual members of the adoptive triad.

The internal consistency indices of the scale and its subscales were adequate. Regarding the evidence of convergent validity, the OAS-S and its subscales were strongly related to four myths about the benefits of open adoptions for each member of the adoptive triad. In addition, we observed that beliefs about the impact of open adoption for children were more strongly related to the perception of the impact on the adoptive family than to the impact on the biological family.

As limitations of the study, we note that convergent validity could not be examined optimally, as no other validated instruments were found to assess beliefs about open adoption, a limitation that this study shares with the validation study of the original scale (Brown et al., 2007). Other limitations of the study are related to the type of sampling and sample size used for the study. Most of our sample was formed by young women with university studies, so it would be relevant to evaluate these attitudes in more representative samples of the general population.

Some limitations are related to the adjustment of the scale to the adoption system in Spain. On the one hand, the scale identifies biological family with biological parents, while open adoption with siblings is proving very frequent in our country (Adroher et al., 2023). Therefore, it is important to include a subscale that collects beliefs about the impact of open adoption among siblings or other members of the biological family.

On the other hand, this questionnaire assesses attitudes toward contact or maintaining a relationship generically. However, part of the success of open adoption involves appropriate contact modulation for each case. Spanish respondents may be imagining visits between the biological family and the child, the preferred mode of contact in foster care, which represents the highest degree of contact. However, the possibility of evaluating differential attitudes toward different forms of lower-intensity contact (letters, telephone, videoconference) could provide a more nuanced view of the attitude toward open adoption in families and professionals in the face of intervention. It is, therefore, relevant in future research to incorporate different forms of contact to deepen the understanding of beliefs and attitudes toward open adoption.

Another future line of research related to attitudes toward open

Table 3. Correlation Matrix between the OAS-S Scale and four Myths about the Benefits of Open Adoption

	OAS-S	AF	BP
1. No good will come from biological parents keeping in touch with the adoptive family.	.62**	.55**	.54**
2. No good will come from biological parents keeping in touch with their children when they are adopted by other families.	.64**	.58**	.56**
3. No good will come from the adopted child having contact with their biological family.	.69**	.69**	.54**
4. No good will come from the biological parents having contact with the adopted child's biological family.	.63**	.63**	.49**
Myths about the benefits for biological parents.	.66**	.59**	.58**
Myths about the benefits for the adoptive family.	.73**	.73**	.57**
Myths about the benefits of open adoption	.75**	.71**	.62**

Note. OAS-S = Open Adoption Scale total score; AF = myths about the adoptive family (about adopted children and adoptive parents); BP = myths about biological parents; myths about benefits to birth parents = sum of items 1 and 2; myths about benefits to adoptive family = sum of items 3 and 4; myths about benefits of open adoption = sum of items 1, 2, 3, and 4.

adoption is to apply this instrument to adoption professionals. This would add quantitative evidence to the qualitative evidence already existing in our cultural context on professionals' attitudes toward open adoption (Corral et al., in press; Rosser & Berástegui, 2017).

Finally, we note that open adoption was developed in the Anglo-Saxon world, especially concerning private adoptions, whereas authorities have been more prudent in promoting adoptions from care (Faulkner & Madden, 2012; Frasch et al., 2000; Ward et al., 2022), which is more similar to the adoption system in Spain. Open adoption can be a measure to mobilize the development of permanency planning for older children or groups of siblings, but it must be accompanied by research and monitoring of the efficiency of the measures, an effort in which the tool validated herein and its future developments can play a crucial role.

In conclusion, the OAS-S is a 14-item scale that assesses attitudes toward open adoption in Spanish (see Appendix A and B). The instrument has good psychometric properties, and its brevity and easy application make it useful for evaluating beliefs about open adoption in adoption technicians, adoptive families, and the general population. In addition, this instrument has the potential for research on changing social attitudes toward open adoption in other Spanish-speaking contexts, although further cross-cultural validation should be considered (Abell et al., 2006).

Conflict of Interest

The authors of this article declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Abell, N., Ryan, S., Kamata, A., & Citrolo, J. (2006). Bilingual validation of the Family Responsibility Scale. *Journal of Social Service Research, 32*(3), 195-212. https://doi.org/10.1300/J079v32n03_11
- Adroher, S., Gómez, B., Berástegui, A., & Sánchez, M. (2023). La adopción abierta en el derecho español. Sus antecedentes, y su aplicación administrativa y judicial [Open adoption in Spanish law. Its background, and its administrative and judicial application]. *Revista Crítica de Derecho Inmobiliario, 800*, Article 3147-3191.
- Aramburu, I., Baró, M. S., Aznar-Martínez, B., Testor, C. P., Pujols, M. D., Junyent, V. M., & Brodzinsky, D. (2015). Validación preliminar de una versión en español de la escala Adoption Communication Scale para adolescentes adoptados [Preliminary validation of a Spanish version of the Adoption Communication Scale for Adopted adolescents]. *Studies in Psychology, 36*(3), 633-642. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02109395.2015.1078551>
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*(2), 238-246. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238>
- Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin, 88*(3), 588-606. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588>
- Bentler, P. M., & Chou, C. P. (1987). Practical issues in structural modeling. *Sociological Methods & Research, 16*(1), 78-111. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00491241870160010>
- Berástegui, A. (2005). *La adaptación familiar en adopción internacional: una muestra de adoptados mayores de tres años en la Comunidad de Madrid* [Family adaptation in international adoption: A sample of adoptees over three years of age in the Community of Madrid]. Consejo Económico y Social. Comunidad de Madrid.
- Berástegui, A. (2016). La adopción abierta: De las creencias a los datos [Open adoption: From beliefs to data]. In R. Arce, B. G. Amado, & M. Vilariño (Eds.), *IX Congreso Internacional de Psicología Jurídica y Forense: libro de actas* [IX International Congress of Legal and Forensic Psychology: Minute book] (pp. 148-150). Sociedad Española de Psicología Jurídica y Forense.
- Berástegui, A., & Jódar, R. (2013). Comunicación sobre la adopción: logros y lagunas en la adopción internacional en España [Communication on adoption: achievements and gaps in international adoption in Spain]. *Revista Familia, 46*, 43-55. <https://doi.org/10.36576/summa.31326>
- Brodzinsky, D. M. (2005). Reconceptualizing openness in adoption: Implications for theory, research and practice. In J. Palacios & D. M. Brodzinsky (Eds.), *Psychological issues in adoption: Research and practice* (pp. 145-166). Praeger.
- Brodzinsky, D. (2006). Family structural openness and communication openness as predictors in the adjustment of adopted children. *Adoption Quarterly, 9*(4), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1300/J145v09n04_01
- Brown, D., Ryan, S., & Pushkal, J. T. (2007). Initial validation of the Open Adoption Scale: Measuring the influence of adoption myths on attitudes toward open adoption. *Adoption Quarterly, 10*(3-4), 179-196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926750802163246>
- Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. The Guilford Press.
- Corral, S., Martín, N., & Sanz, M. (in press). *Apertura en la adopción: abordaje de orígenes y adopción abierta desde la perspectiva de los profesionales* [Open adoption: Addressing origins and open adoption from the professionals' perspective].
- Curran, P. J., West, S. G., & Finch, J. F. (1996). The robustness of test statistics to nonnormality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychological Methods, 1*(1), 16-29. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.1.1.16>
- del Pozo de Bolger, A., Dunstan, D., & Kaltner, M. (2021). An exploratory study on open adoptions from foster care in NSW, Australia: Adoptees' psychosocial functioning, adoptive relationships, post-adoption contact and supports. *International Social Work, 64*(1), 85-100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872818808343>
- Díez, S. (2018). La aplicación de la adopción abierta en España. Una visión en cifras y algo más [The application of open adoption in Spain. A vision in figures and more]. *RDUNED: Revista de Derecho UNED, 22*, 159-182. <https://doi.org/10.5944/rduned.22.2018.22276>
- Faulkner, M., & Madden, E. E. (2012). Open adoption and post-adoption birth family contact: A comparison of non-relative foster and private adoptions. *Adoption Quarterly, 15*(1), 35-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926755.2012.661333>
- Frasch, K. M., Brooks, D., & Barth, R. P. (2000). Openness and contact in foster care adoptions: An eight-year follow-up. *Family Relations, 49*(4), 435-446.
- Gómez, B. (2018). La implantación de la adopción abierta en España [The implementation of open adoption in Spain] *Actualidad Civil, 2*.
- Grotevant, H. D. (2000). Openness in adoption: Research with the adoption kinship network. *Adoption Quarterly, 4*(1), 45-65. https://doi.org/10.1300/J145v04n01_04
- Grotevant, H. D., Lo, A. Y. H., Fiorenza, L., & Dunbar, N. D. (2017). Adoptive identity and adjustment from adolescence to emerging adulthood: A person-centered approach. *Developmental Psychology, 53*(11), 2195-2204. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000352>
- Grotevant, H. D., Rueter, M., Wrobel, G. M., & Von Korff, L. (2009). *Summary of wave 3 methods. Adoptive families: Outcomes for young adults*. https://www.umass.edu/ruddchair/sites/default/files/w3_summary_of_methods_042509_final.pdf
- Haas, B. (2015). Treinta años de experiencia en la adopción abierta: Ventajas, obstáculos y conocimientos profesionales expertos [Thirty years of experience in open adoption: Advantages, obstacles and expert professional knowledge]. *Boletín SSI/CIR, 194*, 6-7.
- Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 30*(2), 179-185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02289447>
- ISS/IRC (2015). La adopción abierta: Varias velocidades, varias medidas. Centro Internacional de referencia para los derechos del niño privado de la familia [Open adoption: Various speeds, various measurements. International Reference Center for the Rights of the Child Deprived of the Family]. *Boletín ISS/IRC, 194* 1-17. <https://iss-ssi.org/resource-siss/n-194-la-adopcion-abierta-varias-velocidades-varias-medidas/?lang=es>
- Izquierdo, I., Olea, J., & Abad, F. J. (2014). Exploratory factor analysis in validation studies: Uses and recommendations. *Psicothema, 26*(3), 395-400. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2013.349>
- Ley 26/2015 de protección a la infancia y la adolescencia [Law 26/2015 on the protection of children and adolescents] (2015, July 29). *BOE 180*. <https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2015-8470>
- Lo, A., & Grotevant, H. (2020). Adoptive parenting cognitions: Acknowledgement of differences as a predictor of adolescents' attachment to parents. *Parenting, Science and Practice, 20*(2), 83-107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295192.2019.1694826>
- Martin, I. (2020). Reflexiones en torno al nuevo escenario de la adopción [Reflections on the new adoption scenario]. *Zerbitzuan, 71*, 37-51. <https://doi.org/10.5569/1134-7147.71.03>
- McSherry, D., Larkin, E., Fargas, M., Kelly, G., Robinson, C., Macdonald, G., Schubotz, D., & Kilpatrick, R. (2008). *From care to where? A care pathways and outcomes report for practitioners*. Queens University Belfast, Institute of Child Care Research.
- Neil, E. (2004). The contact after adoption study: Indirect contact and adoptive parents' communication about adoption. In E. Neil & D. Howe (Eds.), *Contact in adoption and permanent foster care: Research, theory and practice* (pp. 46-64). BAAF.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Robinson, S. (2017). Child welfare social workers and open adoption myths. *Adoption Quarterly, 20*(2), 167-180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926755.2017.1289489>
- Rosser, A., & Berástegui, A. (2017). Retos y dificultades para la implantación de la adopción abierta en España. El papel de la mediación [Challenges and difficulties for the implementation of open adoption in Spain.

- The role of mediation]. *Mediaciones Sociales*, 16, 175-191. <https://doi.org/10.5209/MESO.58115>
- Ryan, S. D., Harris, G., Brown, D., Houston, D.M., Livingston Smith, S. L., & Howard, J.A. (2011). Open adoptions in child welfare: Social worker and foster/adoptive parent attitudes. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 5(4), 445-446. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2011.599772>
- Schmitt, T. A. (2011). Current methodological considerations in exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 29(4), 304-321. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282911406653>
- Sesé, A. (2023). *Análisis SEM con R: modelos básicos y avanzados (instrucciones y outputs)* [SEM analysis with R: Basic and advanced models (instructions and outputs)]. Universidad de las Islas Baleares.
- Siegel, D. H. (2013). Open adoption: Adoptive parents' reactions two decades later. *Social Work*, 58(1), 43-52. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23719590>
- Smith, C., & Logan, J. (2004). *After adoption: Direct contact and relationships*. Routledge.
- Smith, M., González-Pasarín, L., Salas, M., & Bernedo, I. M. (2020). Review of benefits and risks for children in open adoption arrangements. *Child and Family Social Work*, 25(4), 761-774. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12753>
- Sobel, M., Daly, K., & Kelloway, K. (2004). Paths to the facilitation of open adoption. *Family Relations*, 49(4), 419-424. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2000.00419.x>
- Sorek, Y., Simon, B. B., & Nijim-Ektelat, F. (2020). Motivation matters: Parents' path to adoption as related to their perceptions of open adoption. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 118, Article 105430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105430>
- The Jamovi Project. (2022). Jamovi. (Version 2.3) [Computer software]. <https://www.jamovi.org>.
- Velicer, W. F. (1976). Determining the number of components from the matrix of partial correlations. *Psychometrika*, 41(3), 321-327. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02293557>
- Ward, H., Moggach, L., Tregeagle, S., & Trivedi, H. (2022). *Outcomes of open adoption from care: An Australian contribution to an international debate*. Springer Nature.
- Wolffgram, S. M. (2008). Openness in adoption: What we know so far—a critical review of the literature. *Social Work*, 53(2), 133-142. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/53.2.133>

Appendix A

Open Adoption Scale-Spanish (in Spanish)

Entendemos por adopción abierta aquella en la que se acuerda cierto grado de comunicación entre la familia de origen y el niño/a adoptado/a y/o su familia adoptiva.

¿Qué piensas de la adopción abierta para sus distintos protagonistas?	Totalmente en desacuerdo	Bastante en desacuerdo	Ligeramente en desacuerdo	Ligeramente de acuerdo	Bastante de acuerdo	Totalmente de acuerdo
1. Los padres biológicos que han perdido la custodia de sus niños porque están en prisión no deberían tener contacto con sus hijos biológicos.						
2. No se puede confiar en que los padres biológicos que anteponen las drogas a las necesidades de sus hijos vayan a poner alguna vez a sus hijos por delante.						
3. Los padres biológicos que maltratan a sus hijos hasta perder su tutela no tienen nada positivo que ofrecer a sus hijos.						
4. Los padres biológicos a los que la Administración retira a los niños por maltrato no se merecen poder verlos.						
5. Los padres biológicos no pueden sacar nada bueno de mantenerse en contacto con sus hijos cuando son adoptados por otras familias						
6. Los niños se vincularán mejor con sus padres adoptivos si no tienen contacto con su familia biológica.						
7. El sentimiento de pertenencia del niño a la familia adoptiva se hace más fuerte cuando se corta el contacto con la familia biológica.						
8. Los niños formarán un mejor apego a su familia adoptiva si no tienen contacto con su familia biológica.						
9. Los niños que son adoptados vivirán confusos si continúan viendo a sus padres biológicos.						
10. Es mejor para los adoptados empezar de nuevo, sin ningún contacto con sus padres biológicos.						
11. Los padres adoptivos no adoptarían niños si tuvieran que tener trato con la familia biológica del niño.						
12. Los padres adoptivos se sentirán menos legitimados en el rol de padres si el niño sigue teniendo contacto con su familia biológica.						
13. Para desarrollar una identidad familiar fuerte, los padres adoptivos necesitan una adopción cerrada.						
14. Sería imposible reclutar a padres adoptivos si pensaran que tienen que lidiar con la familia biológica.						

Normas de corrección de la Open Adoption Scale-Spanish

La composición de la escala OAS-S es la siguiente:

- Padres Biológicos (PB): Ítems 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- Familia Adoptiva (FA): Ítems 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14

Para obtener la **puntuación total de cada subescala** se deben sumar las puntuaciones de los ítems de cada subescala y dividir el resultado por el número de ítems que la componen (PB: 5 ítems, FA: 9 ítems). De esta manera, las puntuaciones de las subescalas oscilarán entre 1 y 6, como las opciones de respuesta.

Para calcular la **puntuación total de la escala OAS-S** se deben sumar las puntuaciones de cada subescala y dividir el resultado entre 2. De esta manera, la puntuación total de la escala OAS-S oscilará entre 1 y 6, como las opciones de respuesta.

Appendix B

Open Adoption Scale-Spanish (in English)

We define open adoption as one in which some degree of communication is agreed on between the family of origin and the adopted child and/or their adoptive family.

What do you think about open adoption for its different protagonists?	Strongly disagree	Fairly disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Fairly agree	Strongly agree
1. Biological parents who have lost custody of their children because they are in prison should not have contact with their biological children.						
2. Biological parents who put drugs before their children's needs can never be trusted to put their children first.						
3. Biological parents who abuse their children until they lose their guardianship have nothing positive to offer them.						
4. Biological parents whose children are removed by the Administration for abuse do not deserve to see them.						
5. No good will come from biological parents keeping in touch with their children when they are adopted by other families						
6. Children will bond better with their adoptive parents if they have no contact with their biological family.						
7. The child's sense of belonging to the adoptive family becomes stronger when contact with the biological family is severed.						
8. Children will form a better attachment to their adoptive family if they have no contact with their biological family.						
9. Adopted children will be confused if they continue to see their biological parents.						
10. Adoptees should start over without any contact with their biological parents.						
11. Adoptive parents would not adopt children if they had to deal with the child's biological family.						
12. Adoptive parents will feel less legitimized in their role as parents if the child continues to have contact with their biological family.						
13. To develop a strong family identity, adoptive parents need closed adoption.						
14. It would be impossible to recruit adoptive parents if they thought they had to deal with the biological family.						

Correction rules of the Open Adoption Scale-Spanish

The composition of the OAS-S scale is as follows:

- Biological Parents (OAS-S-BP): Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- Adoptive Family (OAS-S-AF): Items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14

To obtain the total score of each subscale, the scores of the items of each subscale must be added and the result must be divided by the number of items that compose it (BP: 5 items, AF: 9 items). Thus, the scores of the subscales will range between 1 and 6, like the response options.

To calculate the **total score of the OAS-S**, the scores of each subscale must be added and the result divided by 2. Thus, the total score of the OAS-S scale will range between 1 and 6, like the response options.

