

**For the Sake of Human Equality:
a scientific, social, and political assessment of gay adoption**

Graham Rengert

Class of 2009
College of Arts & Sciences
Cornell University

**2690 Clara Dickson Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853**

Word Count: 5,430

October 2007

For the Sake of Human Equality: a scientific, social, and political assessment of gay adoption

Steven Lofton and Roger Croteau are the fathers of Frank, Tracy, Bert, Ernie, and Wayne (and deceased Ginger). Bert, now twelve, has been a part of the family since he arrived as a HIV-positive foster child when he was nine weeks old. All of his brothers and sister were also HIV-positive foster children, taken in by the two pediatric nurses who have been together for over twenty years. The family lives together in Portland, Oregon where they moved after a legal battle with the state of Florida threatened to tear their family apart. It happened when Bert tested negative for HIV (the reversion is a fairly common occurrence among HIV-positive children who receive early medical treatment). The law held that he would have to be adopted now that he was HIV-negative. When Lofton filed for the adoption, he left a part of the application blank—the part about his sexual orientation. The adoption was denied because it was incomplete. Lofton and Croteau feared that someone could come for Bert any day to take away their son. They brought their case to court in 1999. It was the fourth time that someone had tried to challenge the law prohibiting gay adoption.¹ But this time, on the appeal, the American Civil Liberties Union and Rosie O'Donnell joined the fight to legalize Lofton and Croteau's fatherhoods. On March 14, 2002, *Primetime Live* aired a program called *Rosie's Story: For the Sake of the Children* in which O'Donnell came out as a gay parent on national television to increase national pressure on Florida and destabilize the “long-standing assumptions that homosexuality and ‘family values’ must inevitably clash” (Lewin 2006: 129). The program

¹ In the context of this paper, “gay” means lesbian women, gay men, and bisexual men and women unless otherwise noted. “Gay adoption” refers to an adoption by a gay individual or couple.

alerted the nation to a polarizing issue that has inspired substantial research and many books, but still remains largely shrouded in mystery and misconceptions. This paper will attempt to clear up the misconceptions about gay parenthood and gay adoption and prove that adoption discrimination based on sexual orientation is unfounded and unjust.²

The first section of the paper will briefly address the history and current state of gay adoption. The second section will examine the current barriers to gay adoption. The third section will provide an overview of the arguments against gay adoption while the fourth section will explore the studies that address these arguments. The final section will apply the points made by this paper to the current situation of restricted and stigmatized gay adoption.

1. An overview of gay adoption

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, adoption was the explicit responsibility of single women as their “natural calling.” But slowly, people began to view this practice as unfair to both the opposite-sex couples who were unable to bear children and the adopted children who were being raised without a father. By the 1920s, formal adoption was almost completely restricted to married couples. Very early on, modern institutionalized adoption was coupled with anti-gay rhetoric. In *Adventuring in Adoption*, a 1939 guide for prospective adoptive parents, the authors proposed that unmarried adoptive mothers needed to manifest some degree of masculinity to make up for the lack of a father without being the “non-feminine, swaggering type” and by no means could two women adopting together be a solution to providing a child with two parents (Berebitsky 2006: 32). Throughout the middle of the

² In this paper, adoption refers to primary adoption, or the adoption of a child by a couple or individual for the purpose of starting a family. The paper will not be addressing the issues of second parent adoption, the adoption of one partner’s legal child by the other partner, or coparenting adoption, where a gay man adopts the child of a female friend (often a lesbian).

twentieth century almost all adoptions were by married couples. But in the last couple decades have seen the arrival of a “gay baby boom,” riding on the development of gay rights and alternative techniques for having children (Johnson & O’Connor 2002: 95).

The new phenomenon was marked by numbers and visibility as Mom & Mama families multiplied and *Heather Has Two Mommies* by Leslea Newman was published in 1989.

Calculating the size of the gay baby boom is very difficult, but rough estimates place the range around six to ten million gay parents with six to fourteen million children raised by at least one gay parent (Johnson & O’Connor 2002: 1; Buell 2001: 75). While adoption was the route to parenthood of choice for eighty-seven percent of primary gay fathers and six percent of primary lesbian mothers (another six percent resorted to adoption after biological methods failed), the process discriminates against gay individuals and couples (Slater 1995: 96; Johnson & O’Connor 2002: 97).³ In some states and at some agencies, gay people are barred from adopting.

Elsewhere, gay prospective parents are seen as suitable placements for special needs, minority or mixed race, and older children—conventionally labeled “hard to place”—and for children from some foreign countries (Lewin 2006: 129, 135-136).

2. Barriers and obstacles to gay adoption

There are numerous barriers and obstacles facing same-sex attracted individuals and couples who are seeking to adopt. Thus resistance to gay adoption is stratified through several levels: state law, agency policy, public stigma, and foreign countries.

³ “Primary” indicates that the family was formed by children who were had in the context of a gay household. This would exclude gay parents in heterosexual relationships or gay parents of children that they had while in the context of a heterosexual relationships.

Law— “When heterosexuals fall in love, get married and have children, the last thing on their minds is taking legal steps to protect their family” (Buell 2001: 75). The legal system is the most insurmountable barrier to many gay people seeking adoption. The legal opposition to gay adoption is unfounded (see section 4: the research on gay parents and their children, page 7) and thus prejudiced towards the heterosexual people. Courts make decisions based on a “traditional family model” that may not exist anymore (Barret & Robinson 1990: 7). Many civil rights groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union, the Human Rights Campaign, and Lambda Legal have recognized the fallacies and injustices of the legal discrimination within adoption and have been challenging the state laws and court rulings enforcing this barrier.

The three most obstructive states are Florida, Mississippi, and Utah (Johnson & O’Connor 2002: 30). As of June 2003, Utah and Mississippi prohibit adoption by same-sex couples but not by same-sex attracted individuals. Florida allows same-sex attracted people to be foster parents but not adoptive parents, whether single or as a couple (Hunter & Joslin & McGowan 2004: 146). The Florida statute states: “No person eligible to adopt under the statute may adopt if that person is a homosexual” (Buell 2001: 81). However, legal attacks on gay parenting are not limited to these three states. As of October 2000, Arkansas legally prohibits lesbians and gay men from being foster parents using a direct question on the application. Utah does the same indirectly by requiring foster parents to be legally married (Hunter & Joslin & McGowan 2004: 146). In Hawaii, judges justify anti-gay rulings by declaring that opposite sex parents are simply “best for children” (Hunter & Joslin & McGowan 2004: 118). Several states, including most recently Ohio, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, and California, have recently ended some form of legal prohibition on gay adoption (Buell 2001: 81-82; Hunter & Joslin & McGowan 2004: 146; Walzer 2002: 125).

Agencies—Even where legal avenues permit gay adoption, agencies often set up insurmountable roadblocks (Ricketts & Achtenberg 1987: 97-98). Kenneth B. Morgen, who adopted a boy with his same-sex partner, describes the adoption process for a gay couple as a series of frustrating “detours and dead ends” (Morgen 1995: 54). Although it is well-known that some agencies review gay applicants with more scrutiny or even refuse them adoption altogether, there are no known cases of gay couples challenging the decision of a private agency. Though private, these agencies are “quasi-governmental entities” and may be held liable if discrimination based on sexual orientation is proven. The problem is that the agency could simply maintain that some other characteristic determined the unfitness of the person or couple (Ricketts & Achtenberg 1987: 104; Buell 2001: 83). Jeremy, a gay father who adopted in New York State, felt forced to lie to the adoption agency in order to be granted the adoption: “I did not say I was gay, which was a lie of omission, I filled out my medical report rather than giving it to my doctor, and I colored the race demographics of the area I lived in so there wouldn’t be any reason standing in my way to adopt. I always feel awkward admitting this. I just felt none of those tidbits of information has anything to do with my ability to parent” (Drucker 1998: 41-42).

There are those who say that agencies are by and large accepting of gay applicants (Dickerson & Allen 2006). Much of this must be due to the fact that gay people are usually the recipients of ‘hard to place’ foster kids or foreign children and most gay people enter the process expecting this. Indeed, a national survey found that most gay prospective parents do not anticipate any resistance from adoption agencies and less than half experience any resistance (Johnson & O’Connor 2002: 117). Being able to research agencies or even to run most of the adoption process on the web has definitely made it easier for gay people to adopt. “In an era of Internet-based circulation of information, gay men may be as able as other potential parents to navigate the complicated routes that lead them to the children they want” (Lewin 2006: 135).

Public—Still more barriers to adoption are posed by public stigma. There are various methods used to avert or soften public opposition. For instance, some gay couples only apply to adopt girls so as to bypass suspicion (Lewin 2006: 140). On adoption websites, gay men post pictures of themselves playing sports or hanging around the barbeque with other men. Couples will often mention their relationship to reference its longevity, but they rarely post pictures that display their affection for each other the way opposite-sex couples do (Lewin 2006: 138).

Foreign countries—A final barrier that must be addressed is that of foreign countries that refuse to allow gay adoption of their orphans. Gay prospective parents are limited to a few countries, mainly Russia and Guatemala, and must conceal their sexual orientation from foreign officials although not generally from the US agency. Often, one member of a same-sex couple will have to adopt alone, pretending to be single. Some same-sex attracted individuals reject international adoption because they refuse to conceal their gay identities. (Lewin 2006: 139).

3. The objections to gay adoption

Barring a small number of objections posed by feminist lesbian and gay activists who contend that parenthood undermines their struggle for freedom and equality, most opposition to gay adoption concerns the well-being of the child. Many different reasons have been cited to make the claim that gay parents are detrimental to the development of children, even proposing that the supposed risk of AIDS makes gay men unfit to adopt (Barret & Robinson 1990: 121). In an interview on *Primetime: Rosie's Story*, Republican representative Randy Ball of Cape Canaveral, Florida strongly opposed Lofton and Croteau's quest to adopt Bert because, while he agrees that the parenting of Bert has been "commendable," he believes that growing up with gay parents "greatly stunts [a child's] development emotionally and psychologically." In their

lengthy guide to adoption, adoption agency social worker James L. Dickerson and psychologist Mardi Allen include a tiny section for gay prospective parents that warns that they are unfit for adoption if (1) they cannot prove that they have good relations with the opposite sex and can provide opposite-sex role models or (2) they do not offer strategies for coping with the “inevitable” teasing their child will face because of his or her parents’ sexual orientation or (3) they cannot provide assurance that they will be able to accept their child’s probable heterosexuality (Dickerson & Allen 2006: 171-172). Some of the other points of opposition to gay adoption are that gay parents will present a skewed “homosexual world” that will confuse the child, that childhood development will somehow be adversely affected by having gay parents, that a married man and woman are the “natural” family for a child, that gay people are sexual predators, that gay parents will use their parenthood as a channel for their anger against society, that gay people will flaunt their sexuality before their innocent children, and that “gay lifestyles” are unstable and unsuitable for children (Barret & Robinson 1990: 6; Klein 1973: 88).

4. The research on gay parents and their children

Social scientists began studying gay parenthood in the late 1970s, but progress has been slow (Barret & Robinson 2000: 159). Much of the research has focused on lesbian mothers who are the majority of gay parents and some of this data has been used to draw conclusions about the families of gay fathers (Barret & Robinson 2000: 164). There have been many obstacles to this research—particularly the difficulty of finding a large, unbiased subject pool of primary gay families and finding comparable comparison pools of heterosexual families given the distinctive characteristics of gay families. For instance, it is important to account for the fact that adopted kids, whether adopted by same-sex or opposite sex couples or individuals, show higher rates of

emotional difficulties and learning problems than non-adopted. Some biased studies have drawn conclusions based on incongruent comparison pools or clinically selected subjects (Johnson & O'Connor 2002: 28). Despite the setbacks and difficulties, both qualitative and quantitative studies have overwhelmingly shown that a parent's homosexuality has no significant negative effect on the child. The following is a summary of the major findings on the children of gay parents divided into the seven categories employed by Norman Anderssen, Christine Amlie, and Erling André Ytterøy in their analysis of twenty-three empirical studies from 1978-2000: emotional functioning, [sexuality], stigmatization, gender role behavior, behavioral adjustment, gender identity, and cognitive functioning.⁴ The seven areas of study are in order of most to least studied (Anderssen & Amlie & Ytterøy 2002).

Emotional functioning—Many studies have found that the emotional functioning of children with gay parents is very good, no different from their peers raised by heterosexual parents. Quite a few of these studies have been led by psychologist Charlotte J. Patterson. One of her most recent studies, completed just three years ago, attempted to remove reporting bias by using a sampling from the 12,000 respondents to the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health). The parents and their children were surveyed and interviewed separately and if the parent indicated that he or she was in a “marriage or marriage like-relationship” and that the other person was of the same sex, then the child was said to be living in a same-sex couple household. Forty-four such children between twelve and eighteen years old were selected and matched with a group of adolescents living with opposite-sex couple households. No significant difference was found in the emotional functioning of the two groups of children (Patterson 2006).

⁴ Anderssen, Amlie, and Ytterøy use the term “sexual preference.”

Golombok, Spencer and Rutter (1983), a study conducted in Britain, compared thirty-seven children raised by lesbian mothers to thirty-eight children raised by single heterosexual mothers, all between the ages of seven and fourteen. Through analyzing questionnaires and interviews of the children, mothers, and teachers, the researchers determined that the emotional functioning of the children of lesbian mothers was no different than that of the children with heterosexual mothers (Anderssen & Amlie & Ytterøy 2002).

Sexuality—Sexuality is one of the greatest concerns of those who oppose gay adoption. The main fear is that gay parents will somehow influence the sexual orientation of their children, making them “become” gay. The common conversational argument against this notion is that the vast majority of gay people have heterosexual parents. This logic did not always prevail, as seen in social scientist Carole Klein’s 1973 book that reads: “whether children of declared homosexuals raised in homosexual households can be exclusively heterosexual is not known yet” (89). In the decades since, the notion that the sexual orientation of parents affects the sexual orientation of their children has been disproved by many empirical studies (Patterson 2000; Drucker 1998: 70). These studies usually compare the prevalence of various indicators of same-sex attraction among the children of same-sex attracted parents with a comparison group of children with opposite-sex attracted parents or a comparison to generally accepted figures for their age group. A very few studies have posited that gay children of gay parents might be more comfortable with coming out or acting upon their same-sex attractions (Anderssen & Amlie & Ytterøy 2002; Judith Stacey in *Primetime: Rosie’s Story* 2002).

Jennifer L. Wainright, Stephen T. Russell, and Charlotte J. Patterson analyzed survey responses from a national pool of randomly-selected teenagers to determine if there was a difference in sexual activity among adolescents who were raised by gay parents. The same percentage of teenagers from the group with gay parents and from the group with heterosexual

parents reported that they had previously engaged in sexual intercourse (thirty-four percent).

There was also no significant difference in the percentage that reported having had a romantic relationship in the past eighteen months (Wainright & Russell & Patterson 2004). All data seems to prove that children of gay parents do not develop differently in regards to either sexual orientation or sexual activity.

Stigmatization—Fear that the child will face stigmatization based on his or her parents' sexual orientation has become the “politically correct” or “well-meaning” way to object to gay adoption. While gay parents have been quick to point out that children will tease and exclude other children for anything and everything from their clothes to a parent's goodbye kiss, social workers and the general public have repeatedly expressed concerns that gay parents might cause something more. And accounts have not always disproved this. A 1998 survey of school counselors found that children of gay parents were more often the targets of harassment (Cahill & Tobias 2007: 31). A 1997 study found that, in general, peer harassment of children for having a lesbian-identified mother was rare, but that these incidents were more common among children from lower socioeconomic status (Bos & van Balen & van den Boom 2004). Many children report keeping the sexual identity of their parents a secret from their classmates and friends (Anderssen & Amlie & Ytterøy 2002). However, by and large, studies have consistently proven that the children of gay parents have normal peer relations based on the reports of both children and adult observers (Patterson 2000). In fact, several studies found that the social connections of children with gay parents were even better than their peers. Patterson's Add Health study found that the only statistically reliable difference between the two groups was that the children with same-sex parents felt “a greater sense of connection to people at school” than the children with opposite-sex parents (Patterson 2006).

Gender role behavior—Many of the opponents of gay adoption predict that a child raised by gay parents will be confused by their gender “abnormality” and be unable to portray or comprehend “normal” gender roles.⁵ Often adoption agencies express concerns that gay parents will not provide role models of the opposite sex. Some fear that the perceived gender expressions of effeminate fathers and “butch” mothers will imprint upon their children, but this false assumption is becoming outdated as gay parents and their gay friends rarely enact these gay stereotypes (Klein 1973: 88). In fact, one study found that lesbian mothers feel the need to prove the quality of their parenting and stress “conformity” to their child in the face societal pressure as a visible mother (Bos & van Balen & van den Boom 2004).

When children raised by two mothers or two fathers enter school, or the “heterosexual socializing sphere,” and begin to be taught a heterosexual culture and begin to “play house” with children who were raised by opposite sex parents, do they become confused by the replacement of a homosexual norm with a heterosexual norm as suggested by pedagogues Virginia Casper and Steven B. Schultz (Casper & Schultz 1999: 2)? Or do are they more versatile than this? Studies have consistently supported the second hypothesis, finding that children can adapt and learn both the “heterosexual” and the “homosexual” household, the male and the female role. Quite a few related studies have been developed and conducted since Green (1978) first studied such gender norm expressions as toy and game preferences, peer group composition, clothing preference, roles played in fantasy games, vocational aspirations, favorite television programs or characters, and people-figure drawing of twenty-one children of lesbian mothers. None have yet found any specific atypical patterns (Anderssen & Amlie & Ytterøy 2002; Patterson 2000).

Behavioral adjustment—A few arguments against gay parenting have argued that the inferior child development will result in behavior maladjustments. There are concerns that the

⁵ Whether or not gender conformity is a positive trait is a subject for another paper.

children of gay parents will display poor manners and social skills. Employing a variety of methods including surveys, interviews, playroom observations, and psychological tests, many studies have assessed the behavioral development of children with same-sex attracted parents. None have yet shown a difference in their behavioral adjustment (Anderssen & Amlie & Ytterøy 2002). A clinical sample of 32 children from 28 lesbian mother families were found to be, if anything, more socially advanced than their peers who were raised by opposite-sex couples (Pennington 1987: 59).

Gender identity— At least six studies have investigated the notion that having gay parents could affect a child's gender identity, or "an individual's basic conviction of being male or female." Using a variety of methods from Personal Attribute Questionnaire masculinity and femininity scales (Gottman, 1990) to observed toy and clothing preference (Green, 1978), the six studies completely disprove the idea that gay parents would somehow create transgendered children (Anderssen & Amlie & Ytterøy 2002).

Cognitive function— Several studies have investigated the possibility that there could be a correlation between the sexual orientation of the parents and the intelligence of the child. Three studies analyzed the scores of a total of ninety-one children of lesbian mothers on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children and the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence and found no difference from the results of the general population (Anderssen & Amlie & Ytterøy 2002). Two social scientists Suzanne M. Johnson and Elizabeth O'Connor (admittedly biased because they are lesbian mothers) even posited that children of gay parents could be more intelligent than their peers raised by heterosexual parents because gay couples are more likely to be egalitarian, which is proven to foster better parent-child relationships and increase academic achievement (Johnson & O'Connor 2002: 18).

In summation, empirical research has proven that gay parents raise “normal” children. Outside the field of child development, there are two main objections to gay adoption. The first is the claim that the relationships of gay couples are not steady and therefore gay couples are not suitable to raise children because a separation could be traumatic for the child. It is a common perception that gay relationships are short-lived, especially given the lack of relationship institutionalization like marriage in most cases. (Of course, one must also recognize that heterosexual relationships are increasingly fragile and unreliable, including marriage. Despite this fact, no one questions an adoption by a husband and wife.) However, social science has found that gay men and lesbians do form durable, long-term relationships. Over half of a pool of 125 stable gay couples and over a third of a pool of stable lesbian couples had been together for over ten years. Over a tenth of both pools had been together more than twenty years (Kurdek 2004). Indeed, Lofton and Croteau had been together for 18 years at the time of the broadcast of *Primetime: Rosie’s Story*. Lesbian couples will have been together an average of five years before seeking to have a child. Gay men will have been together even longer (Johnson & O’Connor 2002: 89).

The second main objection to gay adoption outside of the field of child development is the unfounded suspicion that same-sex attracted people will sexually prey on children, either the parents of the child or the friends of the parents. Not a lot has changed since Carole Klein wrote in 1973 that “Many men and women connect homosexuality with child molesting” (80). Most same-sex attracted parents have experienced discrimination by other parents who will not let their children visit the gay parents’ home. The absurd figures of Paul Cameron, published in “Molestation and Homosexuality,” that proposed that twenty-nine percent of same-sex couples molest their children are still cited by judges even though he was expelled from the American Psychological Association (*Primetime: Rosie’s Story* 2002). The vast majority of research finds

that gay men are no more likely to be sex criminals than heterosexual men are. Lesbians and women in general are extremely less likely than men to be sex criminals (Jenny, Roesler, & Poyer, 1994; Patterson 2000; Klein 1973: 81; Barret & Robinson 1990: 42).

5. Framing the legitimacy and purpose of gay adoption

In summary, numerous studies have drawn the conclusion that gay parents are not at all detrimental to the well-being or development of a child. In fact, in the introduction to their book, Suzanne M. Johnson and Elizabeth O'Connor urge caution in attempting to prove that children adopted by gay couples will develop normally into normal adults because this can overlook the possibility that they may develop *better* into more resilient and tolerant adults (Johnson & O'Connor 2002: 4). What is even more important is to study not only the effects of gay parents on children but the effects of children on gay parents. A few scholars and researchers have explored these effects and found that the feelings of joy, purpose, personal growth, and relationship development are very similar to the experiences of heterosexual parents; but parenthood also holds several positive meanings that were unique to the gay parent. For many, it constitutes an indicator of entitlement and full citizenship (Lewin 2006: 141). For some it replaces *gay* with *parent* as their primary identity. For others, parenthood can be a "great equalizer," because gay and heterosexual parents will be sharing an experience and very much engaged in each other's lives (Slater 1995: 106). Essentially, having children is more of a triumph for gay parents, as described by gay father and columnist Dan Save: "Infertility was never an issue for us, just a fact, so we didn't spend much time thinking about it, let alone learning to cope with it. And there were no 'losses inherent in adoption' for us, but only victory" (Lewin 2006: 132).

The restrictions and prohibitions on gay adoption are prejudiced and unjust. Because it has been proven that gay parenthood is not detrimental to childhood, it is time to bring about a change in state law, adoption agencies, and indeed the public consciousness. The barriers to gay adoption must be brought down—but not only for the sake of the 500 thousand children in the foster care system waiting for permanent homes, not only for the sake of the sick and disabled, the abused and the emotionally harmed, the racial minorities and the older (Downs & James 2006). It is time to correct the prejudiced policies and perceptions for the sake of equality and fairness of opportunity.

On *Primetime: Rosie's Story*, O'Donnell proposed that people not focus on the issue of parent's sexual orientation, but instead on the plight of the children in foster care: "It isn't a choice about heterosexual parenting or gay parenting; it's really about whether they'll ever have a permanent parent at all." Her message was for positive change, but misguided because she argued for policy change solely "for the sake of the children." This reasoning perpetuates the second-class status of gay people. It says, the heterosexual people can adopt all the healthy white infants and the gay people will take all the leftovers. While the plight of the children in the foster care system is dire, gay parents are not a solution. A restructuring of the foster care system would better serve to address the situation of the children. The problem of restricted gay adoption, is not that "hard to place" children are not getting permanent homes. The problem of restricted gay adoption is that people are being discriminated against by means of fallacious arguments. The problem is that the law has declared that Steven Lofton, Roger Croteau, Frank, Tracy, Ernie, Wayne, and Bert are not a family.

REFERENCES:

- Anderssen, Norman & Christine Amlie & Erling André Ytterøy. "Outcomes for children with lesbian or gay parents. A review of studies from 1978 to 2000," *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 43 (4), 335–351. September 2002. Accessed online: <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/full/10.1111/1467-9450.00302>.
- Barret, Robert L. and Bryan E. Robinson. *Gay Fathers*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books. 1990.
- Barret, Robert L. and Bryan E. Robinson. *Gay Fathers*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books. 2000.
- Berebitsky, Julie. "Family ideals and the social construction of modern adoption: a historical perspective," *Adoptive Families in a Diverse Society* 29-42. ed. Katarina Wegar. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. 2006.
- Bos, Henry M. W. & Frank van Balen & Dymphna C. van den Boom. "Experience of parenthood, couple relationship, social support, and child-rearing goals in planned lesbian mother families," *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 45 (4), 755-764. May 2004. Accessed online: <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00269.x>.
- Buell, Carol. "Legal issues affecting Alternative families: a therapist's primer," *Gay and Lesbian Parenting*, 75-90. eds. Deborah F. Glazer and Jack Drescher. New York, NY: The Haworth Press, Inc. 2001.
- Cahill, Sean. "The symbolic centrality of gay marriage in the 2004 presidential election," *The Future of Gay Rights in America*. Ed. H. N. Hirsch. New York, NY: Routledge. 2005.
- Cahill, Sean & Sarah Tobias. *Policy Issues Affecting Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Families*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press. 2007.
- Casper, Virginia & Steven B. Schultz. *Gay Parents/ Straight Schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. 1999.
- Curry, Hayden & Denis Clifford & Frederick Hertz. *A Legal Guide for Gay and Lesbian Couples*. Berkeley, CA: Delta Printing Solutions, Inc. 2007.
- Dickerson, James L. & Mardi Allen. *The Basics of Adoption*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers. 2006.
- Downs, Chris A. & Steven E. James. "Gay, lesbian, and bisexual foster parents," *Society for the Psychological Study of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Issues* 22 (2) Summer 2006. ed. Douglas Kimmel. USA. 2006.
- Drucker, Jane. *Families of Value/ Gay and Lesbian Parents and their Children Speak Out*. New

- York, NY: Insight Books. 1998.
- Hunter, Nan D. & Courtney G. Joslin & Sharon M. McGowan. *The Rights of Lesbians, Gay Men, Bisexuals, and Transgender People/ The Authoritative ACLU Guide to a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, or Transgender Persons' Rights*, 4th Edition. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. 2004.
- Lewin, Ellen. "Family values: gay men and adoption in America," *Adoptive Families in a Diverse Society* 129-145. ed. Katarina Wegar. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. 2006.
- Johnson, Suzanne M. & Elizabeth O'Connor. *The Gay Baby Boom: The Psychology of Gay Parenthood*. New York, NY: The New York University Press. 2002.
- Klein, Carole. *The Single Parent Experience*. New York, NY: Walker and Company. 1973.
- Kurdek, Lawrence A. "Are gay and lesbian cohabiting couples really different from heterosexual married couples?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66 (4), 880-900. November 2004. Accessed online: <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00060.x>.
- Lewin, Ellen. *Lesbian Mothers/ Accounts of gender in American culture*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. 1993.
- Mallon, Gerald P. *Gay Men Choosing Parenthood*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press. 2004.
- Morgen, Kenneth B. *Getting Simon/ Two Gay Doctors' Journey to Fatherhood*. New York, NY: Bramble Books. 1995.
- Patterson, Charlotte J. "Children of lesbian and gay parents," *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 15 (5), 241-244. October 2006. Accessed online: <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00444.x>.
- Patterson, Charlotte J. "Family relationships of lesbians and gay men," *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62 (4), 1052-1069. November 2000. Accessed online: <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01052.x>.
- Pennington, Saralie Bisnovich. "Children of Lesbian Mothers," *Gay and Lesbian Parents*. New York, NY: Praeger. 1987.
- Ricketts, Wendell and Roberta Achtenberg. "The Adoptive and Foster Gay and Lesbian Parent," *Gay and Lesbian Parents*. New York, NY: Praeger. 1987.
- Pinello, Daniel R. *Gay Rights and American Law*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press: 2003.

Primetime Live: Rosie's Story/ For the Sake of the Children. March 14, 2002. ABC News. New York, NY: ABC News Home Video. 2002.

Slater, Suzanne. *The Lesbian Life Cycle*. New York, NY: The Free Press. 1995.

Thompson, Julie M. *Mommy Queerest*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press. 2002.

Wainright, Jennifer L. & Stephen T. Russell & Charlotte J. Patterson. "Psychosocial adjustment, school outcomes, and romantic relationships of adolescents with same-sex parents," *Child Development* 75 (6), 1886-1898. December 2004. Accessed online: <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00823.x>.

Walzer, Lee. *Gay Rights on Trial*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc. 2002.