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ABSTRACT

Despite legal recognition of adoption as a legitimate family form, research suggests that adoptive families face a special set of circumstances revolving around the societal stigma involved with adoption. Additionally, adoptees admit to experiencing legal, social, and institutional discrimination because of their adoptive status. Although there have been many celebrations of adoption (such as Dave Thomas), there are cultural norms regarding the family that discipline us to see adoption negatively. Researchers acknowledge that the language surrounding adoption is negative, but do not pursue what that language is or where it appears. Thus, the purpose of my study was to determine how the contemporary public vocabulary repertoire represents adoption.

Three national newspapers and eleven magazines published over a ten-year period were analyzed using a Burkean approach to uncover the clusters that infuse adoption's meaning and to establish whether or not the meaning of adoption is fixed or is undergoing a terministic catharsis. Findings indicate five sets of clusters that surround the word adoption and thus affect its meaning: first, there is an attempt to biologize adoption; second, adoption is replaced in the discourse by a variety of terms that confuse its meaning; third, adoption's meaning is created through the perspective of the adoptive parent; fourth, biology is in direct opposition to adoption; and fifth, adoption is equated to the commodification of children. The research indicates that the meaning of adoption is muddled in the current discourse, thus providing a space for the meaning behind adoption to be transformed through a terministic catharsis. Ultimately, although adoption is
celebrated in the public discourse, the underlying meaning of adoption is somewhat negative, but still very ambiguous.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The public discussion about whether nature or nurture constituted a parent-child relationship reached a fevered pitch during 1993, when a series of legal battles over Baby Jessica ensued. The seeds of this controversy were sown when, on February 10, 1991, only forty hours after giving birth, Cara Clausen, the biological mother of Baby Jessica, signed a release of custody in Iowa. The father named by Cara Clausen also signed a release of custody for the child. On February 25, 1991, Jan and Roberta DeBoer, residents of Ann Arbor, Michigan, filed a petition to adopt Baby Jessica (Faupel, 1994).

Only two days after their petition to adopt Baby Jessica, Cara Clausen told Dan Schmidt that he was Baby Jessica’s biological father, even though he was not the father listed on the custody release form. In March, Dan Schmidt filed a custody lawsuit for Baby Jessica and on December 27, 1991, the adoption petition filed by the DeBoers was dismissed because Dan Schmidt, who was deemed a fit parent, was seeking custody of his biological daughter. In April, Cara Clausen and Dan Schmidt married, now making the case one in which both Dan and Cara were seeking a reinstatement of their parental rights. The judge in the proceeding ordered Baby Jessica to be transferred to Dan and Cara Schmidt, but the DeBoers appealed the ruling and got a stay of the transfer. By September 1992, the Iowa Supreme Court upheld the original transfer and again ordered a transfer of Baby Jessica to Dan Schmidt (Faupel, 1994).

On December 3, 1992, the DeBoers were ordered to surrender Baby Jessica, but instead of doing so, they filed a petition in Michigan under the Uniform Child Custody
Jurisdiction Act (Faupel, 1994). Faupel explains that “the DeBoers claimed that the Iowa courts had never considered Baby Jessica’s best interests and that the Michigan courts should therefore grant them a best-interests hearing” (p. 287). The circuit court awarded custody of Baby Jessica to the DeBoers after “best-interests” hearings were held in January and February 1993. The Schmidts appealed the circuit court decision and in April, the Michigan Supreme Court ultimately concurred with the Iowa Supreme Court and granted custody of Baby Jessica to her biological parents.

On August 2, 1993, 30 month old Jessica DeBoer was transferred from the only parents she had ever known to her biological parents. The media was there to capture the events and the nightly news and daily newspapers showed pictures of Jessica screaming as she was driven away from the only home she’d ever known. Several months later, Dan and Cara Schmidt renamed Baby Jessica, now calling her Anna Jacqueline Schmidt (Moss, 1993).

The Baby Jessica case catapulted adoption into the national consciousness, although very few people were interested in the specific legal merits of the case. For example, the DeBoers had never legally adopted Jessica, since Dan Schmidt’s petition for custody occurred before the adoption was finalized. Despite this fact, the case of the Schmidts versus the DeBoers was viewed as a significant adoption case. Baby Jessica was raised by the DeBoers for two and a half years before going to live with her biological parents and many individuals in the public talked about the case as one in which her biological parents were fighting against the parents who had raised her when, in reality, the biological parents had immediately sought to regain custody.
Not only was this case significant for Americans as a whole, but it was a personally powerful event in my own life. I was fourteen years old by the end of the court battles with the Baby Jessica case and the case had a profound effect on my own understanding of adoption. I've known as long as I can remember that I was adopted, but it was never an issue that worried or bothered me. In fact, it was quite the contrary. I can still remember being in elementary school and carrying in my school bag the book Why I Was Adopted my parents gave me. But when the Baby Jessica case began to receive media coverage, I became concerned. I was old enough to understand what was happening in the case and I was also aware enough to know that I was not in danger of losing my parents. Nevertheless, I often wondered what it must feel like to be leaving the only parents you've ever known.

It was at this time that I knew that if ever confronted with my own biological parents, there was no way I was interested in talking to them, let alone living with them. This wasn't because I hated them or felt ill-will toward them; rather, it was because I loved my parents so much that I knew that was the only family I was ever supposed to be a part of. My parents didn't talk about the case around me, but I always knew that they must have thought about it some and been relieved to know that I was old enough that such an ordeal could never happen to them. In fact, it was only recently when talking with my mother that I realized that losing me to my biological parents had always been a concern of theirs. Luckily for all of us, our family never had to deal with such issues.

The legal battle surrounding Baby Jessica not only was personally frightening and fascinating, but it also led to a national discussion of adoption. That discussion has
continued since the Baby Jessica case, both because of other legal battles between adoptive and biological parents and because of the continuing debate over the importance (or lack thereof) of biological ties in our society.

Although the history of adoption in the United States dates back to the inception of America, the experiences of adoptive families are unique and rarely understood by the general public. The family typically is thought of as the location of our most personal and private relationships, yet several factors require more public involvement in adoptive families than in biological ones. This involvement includes an intrusive role taken on by social workers, physicians, and legal representatives who are responsible for forming adoptive families (Sobel, Delaney, & Earn, 1994).

Despite legal recognition of adoption, adoptive families face a special set of circumstances revolving around the societal stigma involved with adoption (Lansford, Ceballo, Abbey, & Stewart, 2001). More specifically, Kressierer & Bryant (1996) explain that the stigma occurs because the societal expectation is that men and women would prefer to raise biological children to live in “natural” families. Additionally, they report that adoptees admit to experiencing legal, social, and institutional discrimination because of their adoptive status. For example, adoptees report receiving unequal treatment in health care settings because they do not have biological information related to their health. Overall, Miall (1987) found three major themes involving the stigmatization of adoptive families: first, adoptive families are considered second best because a biological tie is assumed to be important; second, adopted children are viewed as second-rate because of their unknown genetic history; and third, adoptive parents are
not considered “real” parents because they are not biologically related to their children. Additionally, the social stigma about adoption often causes friends and strangers alike to ask members of adoptive families appalling and invasive questions about their experiences.

The interesting question involves why the stigma persists. In order to explore this question, this thesis examines how adoption is described in the news media. Although the thesis provides a longer history of adoption, it focuses attention on media reporting of adoption since 1993, when the Baby Jessica case incited intensive public discussion of the topic.

To begin to answer the question surrounding why a stigma exists for the adoptive family even when an adopted child legally is equivalent to a biological child, this thesis will begin to determine if the stigma that exists is found in the discourse. If the stigma is found, I will track the maintenance of the stigma through the public discourse as contained in the media discussion of it. However, before this larger issue can be tackled, I want to outline precisely the nature of the stigma. To establish the stigmatization of adoption, I discuss the evolution and history of adoption by defining the family and adoption, examining modern adoption, and exploring the persistence of adoption stigma. Finally, the public discussion of adoption, my method, research questions, and overview are outlined.

**Evolution and History of Adoption**

Adoption dates back to ancient times in countries that include Egypt, China, India, Greece, and Rome, although adoption was utilized for very different reasons than
those given today. Contemporary adoption practices focus on the best interest of the child, but in earlier days, the practice existed to meet the needs and interests of adults and the general ancient societies (Brodzinsky, Smith, & Brodzinsky, 1998). In England, adoption was practiced (typically by wealthy adults) to meet religious, political, and societal requirements and standards. With these motivations guiding adoption, it is not surprising that nearly all individuals adopted were male under the English system.

The origins of adoption in America are somewhat different. The American family tradition was similar to the English tradition, and that tradition emphasized blood lines above all else. But, as Americans began to struggle with the growing problems of homelessness and child abandonment in colonial times, adoption was seen as a viable alternative. This alternative, however, did not include loving parents taking in helpless children. Rather, Brodzinsky et al. (1998) explain that “a number of social practices, including indenture, placing children in homes for domestic service, apprenticeships, and the emergence of almshouses were used for the care of dependent children who could not live with their biological families” (p. 3). In other words, child adoption began as an exchange of “property” and was a way for citizens to gain profit and status in the new land.

The commodification of children persisted from Colonial times into the early 20th century. During a 1917 investigation of commercial “baby farms,” Herman (2002) reports the slogan of one Chicago baby broker: “It’s cheaper and easier to buy a baby for $100.00 than to have one of your own” (p. 339). Herman goes on to explain that while baby farms were a common occurrence at the turn of the nineteenth century, by the end
of the 1800s, most states had passed adoption laws, following the 1851 Massachusetts statue that defined adoption as a matter of child welfare. The Massachusetts statue, according to Brodzinsky et al. (1998), had six important components. First, the biological parents had to consent to the adoption. Second, if over the age of 14, the child had to consent to the adoption. Third, a joint petition for adoption had to be filed by the pre-adoptive parents. Fourth, the adopters had to be deemed fit parents. Fifth, the adoption had to be approved by the court. And sixth, all legal rights and obligations of the biological parents had to be severed. The legislation passed in Massachusetts was more progressive than the legislation enacted in other states, but by 1929, all states had developed adoption laws. By the 1930s, following legislation in Minnesota, all states legally sealed adoption records.

Once adoption became legalized throughout the United States, the practice began to have a practical purpose. Living in rural America, daily routines included hard work by many people. Large families were a necessity in agrarian times. Although adoption was considered a matter of child welfare by the courts and legislatures, adoption also was considered by average people as a way to increase the number of workers in a family. Most “buyers” wanted boys because they tended to be stronger; in fact, boys were three times more likely to get placed than girls and the average age of adoption was 10 years old (Zelizer, 1985).

Even with progressive laws, the theme of commodification remained. Berebitsky (2000) examined advertisements for adoption, finding:

[The Saturday Evening Post] published “The Baby Market” in 1930, an article that used stock market metaphors to discuss the growing popularity of adoption.
According to the author, it was a “big bull market,” with “baby securities” promising “investors” plenty of “dividends”... [and] in 1924, an Oklahoma department store featured adoption in the publicity for its sale of baby products. Two babies from a local child-placing society were displayed in bassinets; within an hour, enough shoppers had submitted applications to assure good homes for the “advertised” children and the bassinets. (p. 4)

Additionally, Zelizer (1985) clarifies this situation by stating that it was estimated in 1975 that as many as 5,000 infants were still being sold in the U.S. every year, despite strict state and federal regulations against baby selling.

The increased regulation of U.S. child labor laws and adoption laws began to reshape Americans’ view of children as commodities. Agencies began to investigate potential parents more and to charge fees in order to pay for staff dedicated to helping find homes for children. Additionally, the advancement of science helped potential parents feel more secure about adopting. Agencies and scientists alike worked to assure parents that they would receive children who were matched to their “class” and “intelligence” by conducting mental examinations of children in the agencies (Herman, 2002). Following World War II, the demand for healthy and acceptable infants grew rapidly and by the mid-1950s, parents’ demand for children began to exceed the number of adoptable children, according to Brodzinsky et al. (1998). They continue by explaining “[i]n response, agencies developed highly restrictive criteria for placing children with families” (p. 4). The criteria included subjecting potential parents to a variety of psychological, educational, and financial standards that reflected an increased emphasis on status and wealth, an emphasis that still exists today, to some degree, in determining adoptions.
In addition to the restrictions noted above, the issue of race also is important to consider. For the most part, adoptions occurring until the late 1940s involved white parents adopting white children. Although there were occasional instances of African American parents adopting African American children, the vast majority of African American children remained in institutional care because white parents were not interested in them and because African American parents could rarely meet the high standards imposed by adoption agencies. Consequently, Berebitsky (2000) explains:

[A]fter the Civil War, African Americans... kept the tradition of informally adopting orphaned and needy children, a tradition that had originated in Africa and had continued and adapted in slavery... [Additionally,] the racist beliefs that African Americans always took care of their own—and preferred to do so—and that illegitimacy carried less of a stigma in the black community than among whites excused professionals from providing adoption services to African Americans. (p. 9)

The effect of adoption on African Americans was even harsher on Native Americans. Lorie Graham (1998), lecturer on law at Harvard Law School, describes such practices by explaining that in the early 1800s, the federal policy regarding Native Americans was to assimilate them into Euro-American culture through a variety of means, including forced assimilation by education and the loss of property. When assimilation wasn’t occurring quickly enough through education and property loss, Euro-Americans “believed that the answer to the dilemma lay in earlier, longer, and perhaps even permanent removal of American Indian children from their families and communities. If complete assimilation were to be realized, the cohesiveness of the Indian family would need to be destroyed” (p. 18). Graham continues by stating that by 1959, the Child Welfare League of America created the Indian Adoption Project in order to
place American Indian children in non-Indian homes. Ultimately, before the passage of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) in 1978, “5,000 American Indian children were being placed each year in non-Indian homes and church-run educational placement programs by a single religious denomination” (Graham, p. 22). Although the assimilation of Native American children into white culture is startling, it is important to remember that my study brackets the adoption debate over race and ethnicity as well as the texts that portray that debate. While adoption may necessarily carry negative stigma for some racial minorities because of its genocidal elements, I am more concerned with why stigma surrounds even non-racist adoption practices.

Defining the Family

If asked to describe their families, most individuals would gladly talk about their parents, siblings, children, life partner, or even their pets, but the likelihood of individuals describing their families the same way is limited. The reason is simple: we all know what our family is, but we rarely agree on the “proper” definition of a family. Despite this amorphous concept, it is important to attempt to come to some resolution about the meaning of a word so fundamental to our daily lives. Fitzpatrick & Wamboldt (1990) explain that historically, families have been defined in one of three ways. First, definitions have been based on family structure. These definitions categorize families by individuals’ relationships to one another and often include phrases such as nuclear families and extended families. Second, definitions have focused on tasks performed by a family. These definitions typically explain the family as a group of individuals who nurture each other or develop strong bonds between members. The third set of
definitions explains families through the transactional process. Such explanations include people creating a group identity and sharing a history and/or future.

Although all of these definitions help explain families, the evolution of families over the years calls into question these definitions. Galvin (2003), professor of communication studies at Northwestern University, states that “the norm of biologically-related family has been changing, such that contemporary U.S. families are more variable in composition than ever before. Multiple family forms have been legitimated, if not fully accommodated, by changes in laws, customs, and practices” (p. 237). These family forms include adoptive families; step-families; inter-generatational families; lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, and transsexual (LGBT) families; cohabitating adult families; blended families; and sister and brotherhoods of close friends.

To help with this confusion, the U.S. Census Bureau (1998) defines a family as a group of two or more people (one of whom is a householder) related by birth, marriage, or adoption and living together. But is this too broad? Greenstein (2001), professor of sociology at North Carolina State University, reports that in a national poll, 98% of respondents defined a married couple with children as a family, over 75% defined an unmarried couple living together and raising children as a family, and 20% defined two gay men living together as a family. While none of these definitions excludes adoptive families, it does make a clear point: the public is less sure about what constitutes a family, which may help explain why most families that do not include two married parents with children are considered “non-traditional” families. Additionally, even though adoptive families typically fall in the category of two married parents with
children, they also are placed in the “non-traditional” category, helping maintain the social stigma that goes with anything not in the norm.

**Defining Adoption**

It may seem unnecessary to define adoption, although as is the case with family, singular definitions just don’t suffice. *Black’s Law Dictionary* defines adoption as “[t]he creation of a parent-child relationship by judicial order between two parties who usually are unrelated; the relation of parent and child created by law between persons who are not in fact parent and child” (Garner, 2004, p. 52). Pavao (1998), a scholar on national and international adoption issues, believes several other definitions of adoption exist:

In my work, I have found adoption to mean different things to different people:

- To some, adoption is the act of adoption—the legal moment in the courthouse.
- To some it is the life of adoption that the adopted child lives.
- To some it is the life of adoption that the adoptive parents live.
- To some it is the life of adoption that the birth parents live.
- To some it is the adoptive family, inclusive of the child.
- To some it is the extended family of adoption, including the birth parents (whether they are known or unknown, present or not).
- To a child, adoption is about being with the family they are in.

(p. 125)

And still others define adoption as a form of cultural deviance (Kressierer & Bryant, 1996; Wegar, 2000). Wegar states that “adoptive kinship in this society is culturally defined as a deviant form” (p. 365). This definition, according to Wegar, stems from the importance placed on blood ties in the United States. Kressierer & Bryant extend this statement:

The adoptive child-parent relationship lacks the social legitimacy of consanguinity, is often ambiguous linkage for both parent and child, and in some regards may be accorded less than full legal validity and community acceptance as well. Adoption, in terms of traditional kinship norms, can be conceptualized as
a socially and legally constructed kinship tie resulting in a family relationship that is socially marginal and stigmatized, and legally handicapped or “burdened,” making it, in effect, a deviant relationship. (p. 394)

It is also likely that such a negative definition persists because of the various ways in which adoptive families are created. While a clear majority of adoptive families are composed of married parents who adopted children, other family forms exist. Adoption can be found in step-families, foster families, kin-related families, gay and lesbian families, single-parent families, international families, transracial families, and families with children with disabilities. Unsurprisingly, virtually all of these family forms, as discussed above, are considered “different,” thus helping to spur the negative definition of adoption as deviance provided by Wegar.

Modern Adoption

Although the data on adoptees in the United States has been historically difficult to track, the U.S. Census Bureau (2001) reports that adoptive families make up 2% of American families. Additionally, Pertman (2000) explains that “what research there is indicates there are five million to six million adoptees in the United States today... Add in birth parents, adoptive parents, and biological and adoptive brothers and sisters, and the number of people directly connected to adoption soars into the tens of millions” (p. 7). He continues by explaining that nearly six in ten Americans have had a “personal experience” with adoption. Clearly, adoptive families make up a small fraction of American families, but nevertheless involve a significant portion of our society.

Perhaps one of the most important challenges with the current adoption scene is that no matter how often adoption laws are modified, legal and emotional battles between
biological and adoptive parents continue to rage. As discussed earlier, the Baby Jessica case is one of the most famous courtroom battles. Most critics, as well as average individuals, argued that this was an incredibly emotional case that could have been rectified in a number of ways, many of which would have been less painful than the final decision (Gibbs, Sachs, & Gregory, 1993). The case of Jessica is just one example of the ongoing battles that exist in courtrooms and in the public regarding the issue of nurture versus nature. At the conclusion of the Baby Jessica case (and across several different court decisions along the way), biological rights were held as more important than parenting rights.

Although adoption continues to be a complex and controversial issue, since the 1970s, adoption has become slightly more socially acceptable as well as more legally structured. These changes allowed for the institution of adoption to begin to evolve into timid acceptance of other forms of adoption beyond a heterosexual married couple with adopted children. These other forms include step-parent adoptions, single-parent adoptions, gay and lesbian couple adoptions, and special needs adoptions. Transracial and international adoptions have also become legitimate family systems, and as Galvin (2003) notes, such families are in response to rising infertility, legal abortion, and the increase of single mothers keeping their children. In addition, the debate over open or closed records in adoptions also is worth noting.

Stepparent Adoption

While exact data does not exist, adoption by stepparents is considered to be the most common form of adoption in the United States (Grotevant, Dunbar, Kohler, & Lash
Esau, 2000). Grotevant et al. explain that stepparent adoptions usually occur when a stepparent adopts the biological child or children of the spouse s/he is marrying. The adopting stepparent is typically the stepfather, although both men and women adopt their spouse’s children (Grotevant & Kohler, 1999). Stepparent adoptions are fundamentally unique because one parent and the child are still biologically related.

**Single-parent Adoption**

Single adults wishing to raise a child have found a viable option in adoption, and as the number of individuals who choose to remain single increases, so does the number of single-parent adoptions. Grotevant and Kohler (1999) clarify that although single-parent adoptions have risen, recent numbers indicate that single-parent adoptions represent about 25% of all special needs adoptions (which will be discussed in further detail below). Grotevant and Kohler also differentiate single-parent adoptive families from others by reporting that single-parents who adopt differ from other single parents in several ways: many single adoptive parents are in their thirties, have graduate degrees, and often work in helping professions. Additionally, they report that single adoptive parents are more likely to adopt older children and less likely to adopt sibling groups than their married counterparts (Grotevant et al., 2000).

**Gay and Lesbian Couple Adoption**

As social norms change, so does the landscape of the American family. Although gay and lesbian couples are not legally able to adopt in some states, one partner often adopts as a single-parent and raises the child or children in the two-partner household (Grotevant et al., 2000). Grotevant & Kohler (1999) continue by stating “research has
reported few or no differences between children raised by gay and lesbian parents and children raised by heterosexual parents” (p. 168). Dolan (2004) outlines one important difference, however. She illustrates the problem that occurs when the legal system doesn’t correspond to our social acceptance of family forms. Dolan explains that when both partners in the family do not have legal custody of adopted children, separation of the partners can leave the children with only the one legal parent and no ability to contact the other parent.

Special Needs Adoption

Children with special needs, including physical or mental disabilities, extreme health problems, formerly abused or neglected children, and older children (typically who are older than four), among others, historically have been hard to place in adoptive families. Many of these children live in foster homes, institutions, or hospitals because of the emotional, financial, and time constraints that exist for caregivers. However, there are cases of special needs adoptions, and as mentioned previously, single parents are the most likely to adopt special needs children. As the number of healthy infants placed for adoption continues to decline, it is possible that more parents seeking a family will turn to special needs adoption as a way to make their dream come true.

Transracial Adoption

Transracial adoption is a practice that has been incredibly controversial (like most issues involving race). In fact, Simon & Roorda (2000) explain that before Congress passed the Multi Ethnic Placement Act (MEPA) in 1994, which eliminated discrimination on the basis of race or ethnicity for either the child or the potential parent, and the
Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) in 1996, which reaffirmed the importance of the child's best interest in the child welfare system, twenty states considered race when placing children in adoptive or foster homes. Those states that considered race were typically reluctant to place children in homes if it would create a transracial family and instead attempted to keep racial and ethnic attributes the same in adoptive families (except in the case of Native Americans). If a transracial family was created, it was a family that consisted of black children with white parents but not vice versa.

Nevertheless, transracial adoption has increased since the passage of MEPA and ASFA; Simon & Roorda report that in 1992 there were 128,000 transracial adoptions in the United States and that number continues to grow.

Despite recent legislation to allow transracial adoption, the public continues to debate the practice. While some research reports that transracial adoptees fare well, other data concludes that transracial adoptees have a difficult time constructing a racial identity. Since the Civil Rights Movement, there has also been debate about this in the African American and Native American communities. In November 1972, the National Association of Black Social Workers passed a resolution opposing the transracial adoption of African American children, and the debate in their community has continued ever since, according to Hollingsworth (2003). The Native American community has also endured internal strife over the issue of transracial adoption. Lacayo (1988) describes the plight of Native Americans as one in which they feel they are losing their culture, since between 25% and 35% of Native American children are adopted into non-Indian households. Despite the controversy, the reality remains that transracial adoptions
are becoming more and more common, especially as the number of white infants placed for adoption continues to fall.

**International Adoption**

Although international adoption has existed for a significant period of time, the trend to adopt internationally has gained momentum in recent years. Galvin (2003) explains that international adoption has increased significantly in the last three decades due to the decline in the number of U.S. adoptees. Hollingsworth (2003) specifically describes the international adoption process as one that has evolved throughout five specific phases. The first phase came after World War II and allowed Americans to save children from the war torn countries. The second wave occurred after the Korean War for the same reason. The third phase occurred in the 1970s when Americans were rescuing children from Latin and South American countries that were experiencing economic difficulty. The fourth wave occurred during the fall of communism in countries that were especially distressed with the fall of their governments. The fifth and final wave is still continuing to some degree, with the adoption of Chinese children, primarily due to the one-child policy in China, a country that devalues women in particular, and thus has produced an opening for international adoption by American citizens.

Although international adoption has always faced more public scrutiny than intranational adoption, the trend to go overseas appears to be one that will not dissipate any time soon. This is especially true since the number of American infants available for adoption continues to decrease and because prospective parents increasingly fear that
their newly adopted child will be taken away from them and placed back with their biological parents when those parents live in the United States. However, it is important to note that international adoption can be prohibitively expensive for some potential parents. Adoption laws in other countries often require at least one parent (and sometimes both) to travel overseas to adopt their children and the voyage is not a cheap one (Grotevant & Kohler, 1999). Therefore, it is not surprising that most international adoptees are raised in upper-middle to upper-class families, which is somewhat unique in the adoption realm.

Open Adoption

In addition to issues of race and ethnicity in the adoption system, the issue of closed and open adoptions is a modern day controversy. Siegel (2003) argues:

Just 10 years ago most adoption agencies and private adoption facilitators only offered prospective birth parents and adoptive parents traditional confidential or ‘closed’ adoptions—that is, adoptions in which birth families and adoptive families had no contact with each other and only shared with each other written nonidentifying information through the agency or facilitator as a mediator. Today many, if not most, agencies and facilitators offer, encourage, or require an array of ‘open’ adoption alternatives. (p. 409)

Sobol, Daly, & Kelloway (2000) explain that there has been an expansion in the openness of adoption records, with open medical records, knowledge about the biological parents, and, in some cases, contact between the biological parents and the adoptive parents or even the adoptee. Although most studies conclude that open adoptions are more beneficial and helpful to all members of the adoptive triad (biological parents, adopting parents, and adoptee), opponents of the move argue that openness only creates confusion and doubt for the adoptee (Grotevant & Kohler, 1999). Despite these reservations,
almost all adoption agencies today offer varying levels of openness for both biological and adoptive parents from which to choose.

**Adoption Stigma**

Adoption has a bad name, and whether that has occurred consciously or inadvertently by the American public, members of the adoptive triad are constantly reminded of it. Birth mothers who place their children up for adoption often are depicted as selfish, promiscuous, partaking in unsafe sex, and as abandoning their babies. Adoptive parents are portrayed as individuals who desperately want children but can’t conceive because of their God-given genes (Darwinism must mean they are infertile for a reason) and consequently are incomplete or unfulfilled. Adoptees are described as children who long to know who they are and struggle to understand the love of the “strangers” who raise them. The most prevalent theme that develops through such depictions is the importance of genetics. Nelkin & Lindee (1995) argue that the American fascination with genes and genetic explorations and explanations has allowed the biological family to become the prevailing ideal among virtually all Americans. Roberts (1995), professor of law at Rutgers University, continues this argument by explaining that “our ability to tinker with the genes children inherit, as well as the belief that these genes determine human nature, exaggerates the genetic tie’s importance in defining personal identity” (pp. 222-223). In this view, biological children with the same genes as their parents are the most important aspect of family, in the eyes of many Americans.
To illustrate this belief, a survey of community attitudes toward adoption in the United States conducted by the Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute shows startling results (Pertman, 2000). Ninety-five percent of respondents said that adoption “serves a useful purpose” in society, and ninety percent viewed the adoption process positively (Pertman, 2000, p. 132). However, half of the respondents said adoption “is not quite as good as having one’s own child” and about 25% said it’s harder to love a child who is “not your own flesh and blood” (p. 132). Almost one-third of respondents said that they doubted children could love adoptive parents as much as birth parents. Pertman synthesizes the results of this study by stating, “what the people who hold those opinions are saying comes down to this: Adoptive families are disadvantaged, not quite whole, unlucky compared to the rest of us” (p. 132). As a final thought, Pertman, an adoptive father and writer, makes the following painful observation:

Most distressing to me in the Donaldson survey was a statistic that sounds pretty good at first glance—that seventy percent of Americans consider adoptees to be “first rate,” a term that’s not explained but presumably refers to their quality as human beings. Twenty percent answered “second rate” and ten percent said they weren’t sure, which means at least one in five people who learn that my kids are adopted start out thinking they’re somehow inferior, without knowing a single thing about them. (p. 133)

In addition to the survey results, adoptees and members of the adoptive triad also feel the sting when attitudes like those in the survey are expressed face-to-face. A study conducted by March (1995) reveals the perceptions of those directly involved in an adoptive family. She found that the respondents “demonstrated an awareness of adoptive families as a different type of family [and] that awareness emerged from the reaction of others who, upon discovery of their adoptive status, changed their attitude toward them”
Specifically, participants discussed situations in which friends had questioned the strength of their family or told them to "be grateful," and family members had referred to them as "the adopted one" or excluded them from family functions because they were not biological relatives. Such comments can also lead to action, according to Pertman (2000) who describes instances of wills that are altered to exile adopted kin, golf clubs and other facilities that still aren't sure if they should admit members' adopted children like they do their biological children, and other examples of adoptees being excluded because of their lack of genetic ties to their parents.

The apparent stigma embedded in adoption requires scholars to consider one fact, however. It is possible that the stigma exists for good reason and is related to the fact that adoptive families do have significant differences that make them "not as good." This possibility has caused researchers to study issues related to adoptees and their families extensively, and the results have generally found that very few differences actually exist between adoptees and non-adoptees (Borders, Penny, & Portnoy, 2000; Brodzinsky, 1992; Ceballo, Lansford, Abbey, & Stewart, 2004; Kelly, Towner-Thyrum, Rigby, & Martin, 1998; Lanz, Iafrate, Rosnati, & Scabini, 1999; Singer, Brodzinsky, Ramsay, Steir, & Waters, 1985; Sobol, Delaney, & Earn, 1994; Watson, 1997). We can gain some important insight from the most extensive study done on adoptees in their adolescence, on issues including identity, attachment, family dynamics, mental health, and race/ethnicity. Benson, Sharma, & Roehlkepartain (1994) completed the largest study of adoptees and their families in a four-year study. Participants included 881 adoptees, 1,262 parents, and 78 non-adopted siblings. They summarize their results by saying:
Ultimately, the bottom line is that most adopted children and teenagers succeed. Though we find that adopted adolescents tend to do as well as adolescents in general, this is not the best standard for evaluating adoption. A more appropriate standard is to compare each adopted child to what life could have been like had he or she not been adopted. If a methodology could be invented to do such comparisons, we would find that adoption, even when it occurs after infancy, is almost always better than the alternative. (p. 8)

In other words, adoptees and non-adoptees were proven to be rather comparable. Despite this fact, a stigma surrounding adoptive families still permeates attitudes about adoption.

So why does a stigma exist for adoptees and their families? While the answer to this question is complex, the best place to start is with the national media. According to the Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute survey (1997), 52% of Americans regard the media (news, books, magazines, and entertainment) as their primary source of information about adoption. And unfortunately, adoption and its lack of genetic ties between parent and child have long been framed in negative terms by the media.

Wegar (2000) exemplifies the pervasiveness of this negative frame through the text on a recent Valentine’s Day card:

Sis, even if you were adopted, I’d still love you… ... not that you are, of course. At least I don’t think so. But, come to think of it, you don’t really look like Mom and Dad. Gee, maybe you should get a DNA test or something. Oh well, don’t worry about it. We all love you, even if your real parents don’t. Happy Valentine’s Day (Carlton Cards, 1997) (p. 363)
Another example comes from Pertman (2000):

On May 28, 1998, newspapers around the country published a “Herman” cartoon—actually a reprint from years earlier, syndicated that day because the cartoonist was on vacation—that showed a bratty-looking boy holding a pair of shears, which he’d just used to cut down one end of a hammock. A hawk-nosed man lay on the ground between two trees, telling his son: “Tomorrow, I’m having you adopted.” (p. 19)

While both of these examples may seem like harmless humor, they are offensive to individuals sensitive to adoption issues and should be regarded as unacceptable by all. In addition to these two examples, media outlets also tend to overemphasize the fact that an individual is involved in an adopted family. For example, if a news story is covering a mother and her daughter, they typically talk about them in terms of the mother and the adopted child, continuing to reinforce the fact the mother and child are somehow not a “regular” mother and child.

Bartholet (1997) concurs when she explains, “the language surrounding adoption regularly conveys the additional message that adoptive parenting relationships are less powerful, less meaningful, less loving than blood relationships” (p. 244). Scholars note that a stigma exists toward adoptive families, but no research has uncovered what maintains or sustains this stigma. Despite the many celebrations of adoption (such as Dave Thomas), there are cultural norms regarding the family that discipline us to see adoption negatively. Bartholet acknowledges that the language surrounding adoption is negative, but does not pursue what that language is or where it appears. Thus, it is precisely this language that my thesis explores.
Public Discussion of Adoption

Clearly, an extensive amount of research has been conducted on a variety of issues related to adoption. However, one glaring gap in the literature occurs at the intersection between adoption and the public discussion of it. Although a significant body of literature proves that members of an adoptive family face stigma from the general population, no research exists to explain how that stigma is maintained. Additionally, there are several studies which indirectly document the use of derogatory statements toward adoption in the mass media (Berebitsky, 2000; Kressierer & Bryant, 1996; March, 1995; Pertman, 2000), but none that focus their study on the media’s portrayal of adoption on a larger scale. Therefore, there appears to be an important body of literature missing from adoption research which describes how adoption gets portrayed in the media in order to constitute the public’s discourse about the subject.

Although adoptive families have, for the most part, received legal validation of their family form, the public vocabulary surrounding adoption does not give such families the social validation it deserves. This is especially noticeable when a legal battle between adoptive and birth parents occurs because the public debate quickly turns to nature vs. nurture instead of a debate about the legal merits of both the adoptive and birth parents’ cases.

The Rhetoric of Adoption

Modern adoption no longer exists as a way to get extra help on the farm; rather, many laws define adoption and narrow the way in which the process works. Despite this legalization of adoption, many questions about adoption still remain among the general
public. In the legal sense, adoptive families are given the same rights and responsibilities of biological families. In a public rhetoric sense, however, adoptive families are thought about and talked about differently than biological families. Condit (1990) explains “the process of convincing requires not only that a given policy be accepted but also that a given vocabulary (or set of understandings) be integrated in the public repertoire” (p. 6). In other words, Condit believes that laws alone are not enough to shape the way in which a public talks about a specific issue. The adoption literature upholds her claim since there is a societal stigma associated with adoption that isn’t reflected in the law.

This distinction between the legal realm and the public realm becomes more glaring when confronted with the notion that the language we use structures our reality. Throughout his numerous publications, Kenneth Burke, one of the most prominent rhetorical scholars, believes that the language choices we make affect the world in which we live. Ultimately, Burke (1966) concludes “even if any given terminology is a reflection of reality, by its very nature as a terminology it must be a selection of reality; and to this extent it must function also as a deflection of reality” (p. 45). In other words, Burke says the words we choose only focus on parts of the complete picture, while ignoring other parts. Therefore, our language choices help us (and those with whom we converse) understand only a partial picture of the world in which we live.

More specific to adoption, Burke’s notion of terministic screens, or the reflection, selection, and deflection of reality, can be applied. When a rhetor talks about adoption, s/he selects an aspect of adoption, discusses only that aspect, and thus ignores other aspects of adoption. Ultimately, the language chosen by the rhetor paints a picture of
adoption that is only partially accurate, but also one that is talked about as if it were completely accurate.

Research Questions

There is no question that adoptive families are different from biological families; however, there is a significant question about whether or not adoptive families are worse than biological families. The way in which individuals determine their answer to this question is quite dependent on the way the answer has been portrayed by other sources, including the national media. Therefore, this thesis will attempt to answer three main research questions:

1. How does the contemporary public vocabulary repertoire represent adoption?
2. What are the associational clusters that infuse adoption’s meanings?
3. Is the meaning of adoption fixed or is it undergoing what Burke terms a terministic catharsis?

Clearly, adoption discourse is a source of rich information regarding the underlying meanings that surround the process of adoption and its ability to create a family. In order to begin to uncover those meanings, I searched three newspapers and eleven magazines for articles that discussed adoption. First, these articles were read and sorted to establish which articles act as representative anecdotes to the narrative present in public discourse. Second, I determined how words cluster around adoption in the discourse. Finally, I revealed whether or not adoption discourse is undergoing a terministic catharsis and thus changing either its connotative or denotative meaning. To
further understand the components of my Burkean analysis, I provide a discussion of each of the concepts in Chapter 2.

My analysis focused on adoption discourse and looked at whether or not the discourse is undergoing a terministic catharsis. Although I only examined the discourse in a ten-year period, this time period coincides with massive legal and attitudinal changes in adoption policy, and thus is extensive enough to determine whether or not the discourse is experiencing a transformation. Additionally, if a terministic catharsis was happening with adoption discourse, it is important to differentiate between connotative and denotative meanings. In other words, the discourse may be experiencing changes in connotative meaning but not in denotative meaning or vice versa. If that is true, it is important to note which meaning is changing and to hypothesize as to why only part of the meaning is changing.

Overview

In summary, this thesis focuses on the news media’s portrayal of adoption in the United States through the examination of major newspapers and magazines that are indexed in the LexisNexis and InfoTrac databases. This thesis examines three research questions to explore how this portrayal creates and recreates meanings of adoption for American news consumers. I frame the research with Kenneth Burke’s discussion of clusters and analyze news media sources using cluster analysis. This research not only fills an existing gap in the literature on adoption in the United States but also attempts to identify and explain the public vocabulary surrounding adoption.
Chapter 2 examines the theoretical and methodological literature related to Burke's theory of clusters, representative anecdotes, and terministic catharsis and critically analyzes the value of Burkean cluster analysis. Chapter 3 describes the clusters that give adoption both positive and negative meanings. Chapter 4 analyzes the cluster that is undoubtedly negative in adoption discourse. Finally, Chapter 5 discusses the possibility of a terministic catharsis, the connection between adoption stigma and adoption discourse, and the limitations of the study and the future research potential for adoption studies.
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

There is no doubt that the subject of adoption has been discussed by a variety of scholars in a number of fields. Although this research is valuable, a discussion of the rhetoric surrounding adoption also is important for an entirely different reason. As mentioned earlier, the language we use matters. To examine this in more detail, it is important to outline why language matters, examine Burke's definition of human beings, and explain the importance of a focus on public discourse. After doing so, my selection of texts and the heuristic vocabulary that guided my analysis will be discussed.

Britton (1975), Emeritus Professor of Education at the University of London, proclaims "[t]he objects and events of the world do not present themselves to us readily classified... The categories into which they are divided are the categories into which we divide them" (p. 23). Britton's overall claim, therefore, is that the language we use matters because it ultimately creates the way in which we interact with ourselves and others. Similarly, Burke argues that language is important because humans are distinct as symbol using animals who structure reality through language. Burke (1966) uses the following definition (which he outlines in a poetic format) to define man, which he later amended to human being:

Man is
the symbol-using (symbol-making, symbol-misusing) animal
inventor of the negative (or moralized by the negative)
separated from his natural condition by instruments of his own making
goaded by the spirit of hierarchy (or moved by the sense of order)
and rotten with perfection. (p. 16)
This definition provided by Burke is important because it assumes that humans make, use, and misuse symbols, because language is a primary form of symbolicity. In other words, Burke believes that the only way we understand our reality is to understand language. Therefore, language is immensely important, since we make, use, and misuse it for our own purposes.

Condit (1990) explains that “public discourse is constituted of rhetoric” (p. 4). Despite the bad name rhetoric has received in the past i.e., “that’s mere rhetoric”), she traces the Greek root of the word rheo to its root meaning “‘to flow’ or ‘to gush forth’” (p. 4). Using this root word, the importance of rhetoric becomes obvious in the larger context because it is the basis for the flow of meaning that people give to it. Additionally, Condit argues that “rhetoric materializes ideas through the distribution of compelling vocabularies to large numbers of potent audience members or institutions” (p. 9).

Clearly, rhetoric aids our understanding of the world in which we live. This becomes even more paramount when one considers Burke’s notion of terministic screens. As discussed earlier, Burke believes that the very language we use selects the parts of reality we wish to focus on, reflects parts of that reality, and deflects other parts of reality. Therefore, every representation of discourse in the public medium is shielded by a terministic screen that only allows its audience to see portions of reality. Similarly, Ortega (1957) argues that “talking” creates multiple “usages” which both unite us (because we speak the same language) and divide us (because we do not accept the meanings).
McGee (1980) takes Ortega’s reference to language in a general sense and applies it to a specific vocabulary within that language. He says “[i]nsofar as usages both unite and separate human beings, it seems reasonable to suggest that the functions of uniting and separating would be represented by specific vocabularies, actual words or terms. With regard to political union and separation, such vocabularies would consist of ideographs” (p. 8). McGee’s ultimate argument, therefore, is that the way in which we discuss terms depends on whether or not we are trying to unite our audience or separate our audience from one another. In other words, the vocabularies we develop can do either, depending upon what function we need a particular term to serve.

On a multitude of levels, it is easy to see that language matters in our society. Not only do we use language as a way to create meaning and to structure our reality, but we often engage in and consume public discourse without truly understanding the importance of the language being used. Additionally, Burke’s discussion of terministic screens allows us to see that the language we use directs our attention, and thus our attitudes toward a particular subject. Specific to this thesis, the way in which the public discourse frames adoption ultimately determines our attitudes toward it. For example, adoption can be portrayed as positive or negative, normal or deviant, and acceptable or unacceptable, etc. Although these bipolar terms may cluster around adoption, it is possible that those partaking in the discourse are unaware of the clustering effect that is occurring, making it all the more imperative to uncover how terms work in conjunction with others in adoption discourse. Therefore, since a stigma exists, it is important to determine how it is maintained linguistically.
When talking about adoption, we all have a fairly concrete understanding of the denotative meaning of adoption. We understand that adoption is the legal creation of a family between a parent or parents and a child or children. However, despite our understanding of the legal definition of adoption, the connotative meaning differs significantly. This is because there is no one way in which everyone thinks about adoption; rather, the meanings that we associate with adoption vary from person to person and situation to situation. Therefore, by examining the terms associated with adoption in the public discourse, I attempt to uncover the dominant connotative meanings of adoption.

**Text Selection**

McGee (1999) argues that a critic must do more work than the examination of a single text if s/he is to produce any insightful information. He explains:

> Critical rhetoric does not begin with a finished text in need of interpretations; rather, texts are understood to be larger than the apparently finished discourse that presents itself as transparent. The apparently finished discourse is in fact a dense reconstruction of all the bits of other discourses from which it was made. It is fashioned from what we can call “fragments.” (p. 70)

McGee uses the example of Henry Kissinger's 8,000 word opinion in *Foreign Affairs* that he explains will be condensed by a variety of people into approximately 250 words that are chosen as Kissinger's argument “in a nutshell” (p. 70). Additionally, he argues that not only are the texts mere fragments of texts, but also that our culture is fragmented, thus making it even more difficult to determine a pure text.

McGee's insight is important to the study at hand because my analysis is focused on fragments of adoption discourse across a variety of sources and timeframes. More
specifically, I analyze the content of articles on adoption that appeared in two databases. Because an analysis of all public discussions about adoption in two separate databases would number in the high thousands, I selected a diverse group of newspapers and magazines from which to analyze. First, I searched three papers in Lexis-Nexis with the key terms adopt* w/10 (within 10 words of) family (both in full text) restricted by the dates of January 1, 1993, to December 31, 2003. The three papers include The New York Times, The San Francisco Chronicle, and The Atlanta Journal-Constitution. These papers represent three large-market newspapers in three different areas of the country, thus representing different regional viewpoints. Although newspaper readership has been declining, both newspapers and television stations have continued to report similar stories, thus making the news comparable between television and newspapers. Additionally, newspapers have more room to run more stories, and are therefore more likely to write more stories related to adoption than the national network news stations.

The New York Times search produced 257 documents, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution produced 303 documents, and The San Francisco Chronicle produced 106 documents. All documents were read and those articles that used “adoption” in a different context (i.e., the adoption of a policy and adopt-a-family or adopt-a-pet programs) were removed from direct analysis. The remaining documents, which included 77 New York Times articles, 70 Atlanta Journal-Constitution articles, and 31 San Francisco Chronicle articles, were analyzed.

In addition to the Lexis-Nexis search, I also searched magazines using InfoTrac. The key terms of adopt* AND family (in entire article content) restricted by the dates of
January 1, 1993, to December 31, 2003, were used to generate magazine articles. Magazine articles are an important supplement to the major newspapers because magazines have a specific audience that they target and thus are more likely to write articles from a certain point of view that will engage their targeted audience.

The initial search terms and date restrictions for InfoTrac produced 81,161 documents and I determined that this was simply too broad for analysis. Therefore, I created a list of 12 magazines available through InfoTrac that I could study. These magazines included: *Atlantic/Atlantic Monthly*, *Ebony*, *Harper's Magazine*, *The Nation*, *National Review*, *The New Republic*, *People Weekly*, *Progressive*, *Psychology Today*, *Saturday Evening Post*, and *Time*. *Atlantic/Atlantic Monthly* focuses on contemporary social and cultural issues for the general reader. *Ebony* targets African American readers and thus provides an interesting demographic of consumers due to the long standing debate regarding transracial adoption. *Harper's Magazine* is a journal that focuses on literature, politics, culture, and art. *Nation*, *National Review*, and *New Republic* are all politically-focused magazines that attempt to reach a more educated reader. The three of them were chosen together because of their differences in political leaning. *People Weekly* targets a younger audience interested in popular culture, which makes for an interesting demographic when studying discourse. *Progressive* focuses on peace and other domestic social issues and also targets a more educated audience that tends to lean left on the political spectrum. *Psychology Today* is designed for the general reader and focuses on issues of emotional well-being, including family well-being. *Saturday Evening Post* is designed to present issues of health and medicine to the general public.
and could potentially discuss the importance (or lack thereof) of genetics. Finally, *Time* was chosen as a general magazine that covers a variety of issues for the lay reader.

Because InfoTrac only allows you to search ten magazines at a time, I split my searches into two separate searches. First, I searched *Nation, National Review,* and *New Republic.* Within these three magazines, I searched adopt* AND family (in entire article content) from January 1, 1993, to December 31, 2003. This produced 1,315 documents. In order to narrow the search, I ran the search again and changed “in entire article content” to “in title, citation, abstract” in order to get a set of documents that were richer with information related to my study. Using this search method, nine documents were found.

My second search in InfoTrac included a search of *Atlantic, Atlantic Monthly,* *Ebony, Harper's Magazine, People Weekly, Progressive, Psychology Today, Saturday Evening Post,* and *Time.* I searched adopt* AND family (in entire article content) from January 1, 1993, to December 31, 2003. This produced 1,766 documents. To narrow this search, I also changed “in entire article content” to “in title, citation, abstract” but kept everything else the same. This new search resulted in 60 documents.

All 69 articles (from the two InfoTrac searches combined) were full text articles on InfoTrac except one, which was an article in *Ebony.* For this article, I found the date and issue number and found the full text version in Lexis-Nexis and printed it there. All documents were read and those articles that used “adoption” in a different context (i.e., the adoption of a policy and adopt-a-family or pet programs) were deleted from analysis.
The remaining documents, which included 58 articles, were analyzed. The appendix details each Lexis-Nexis and InfoTrac article found for preliminary analysis.

All remaining articles from both Lexis-Nexis and InfoTrac were re-read and categorized by a set of 59 preliminary clusters I found when reading the texts. These preliminary clusters were then grouped together in order to create nine overarching clusters that were prevalent in adoption discourse. These clusters did, however, change as I began my analysis and were transformed into four specific sets of clusters. The specific methods I utilized to complete my critical analysis of the texts are described in detail below.

**Heuristic Vocabulary**

Rhetorical criticism offers scholars an important lens through which to view the media portrayal of adoption. However, it is important to note that rhetorical criticism is not a "method" in and of itself. Rather, it is critical analysis informed by a vocabulary of potentially multiple disciples to discuss the texts related to the subject. Brock and Scott (1980) argue that a critic needs a critical vocabulary to describe, interpret, and evaluate discourse. More specifically, Nothstine, Blair, & Copeland (1994) explain:

> [M]ost of these approaches do not really qualify as 'methods,' in any meaningful sense, to begin with. They are more properly conceptual heuristics or vocabularies; they may invite a critic to interesting ways of reading a text, but they do not have the procedural rigor or systematicity that typically characterizes a method. In fact, it is arguable that they are at their best, critically, when they are least rigorous "methodologically." (p. 39-40)

This distinction is important because my goal as a critic is not necessarily to produce a work that can be replicated if my steps are followed; rather, I want scholars and readers to understand my grounds for text selection and to be able to identify how I came to my
final conclusions. Additionally, results are less likely to be replicated because Notstine et al. also explain that the critic must not remove her or himself from the texts, but rather must interact with them. They detail this interaction by saying:

[T]o act as a critic is to act from a particular stance that is constructed socially, since who we are at any given moment is a matter of our being with others—our families, friends, acquaintances, genders, race, nationalities—both now and in our pasts. All of those connections affect what we will speak about, how we will speak, and what we have to say. (p. 4)

Although the fragments of texts that I analyze are likely to invoke multiple perspectives, my final interpretations are rooted in my own background as an adoptee with unique experiences informed by a critical vocabulary that enables me to identify the ways language directs our attitudes. In other words, I am socially situated within my texts, thus reinforcing the notion that good criticism involves critics who make “socially directed and motivated choices” (Notstine et al., 1994, p. 4).

Admittedly, if my steps are followed perfectly, another critic could easily conclude with a different set of interpretations. Although this “method” runs somewhat contrary to the scientific model, Brock and Scott (1980) posit that it is equally valid. They explain that Nixon’s Vietnam Address has been analyzed from three different perspectives with entirely different interpretations. These differences in interpretations exist because each critic must establish his or her own vocabulary and must situate him or herself in the context of the text(s) at hand. Lucas (2000) agrees with Brock and Scott’s conclusion. He explains that “[r]hetorical critics employ the critical method broadly conceived, but, like rhetorical historians, reject the uniform application of predetermined formulas, which are most likely to produce scholarship that is dull, mechanical,
unimaginative, and commonplace” (p. 99). Lucas continues: “[G]ood criticism does not result from doggedly following a set of formulary procedures, but from the full, free interplay of intelligence with the critical object. The main ideal of criticism is, in Kenneth Burke’s words, ‘to use all that is there to use’” (p. 100).

Saying that I don’t have a “method” of analysis, while true, is somewhat misleading. It is my assumption that the method arises from the texts I analyze. In other words, the way in which the texts speak to me determines the way I analyze the texts and the type of information I pull from the texts. In this vein, it is important to remember that all texts can be viewed from multiple perspectives and by being aware of those perspectives and being willing to embrace multiple meanings, my method is born. This ability to create a method through multiple perspectives is noted by Gusfield (1989) who explains how Burke’s discussion of perspective by incongruity can influence the discussion of “method” for critics:

Perspective by incongruity is more than style in Burke. It is an exhortation to see the limited nature of any one cognitive framework. The terminologies in use are terministic screens that shield us from the multiplicity of possibilities. The wise observer recognizes that opposites are not so different after all... A new taxonomy, a new vocabulary produces an additional angle from which to see reality. (p. 26)

In other words, by recognizing that there are a number of possibilities when reading a text and being willing to embrace the multiple ways to do so, I inherently establish a method for analysis.

Finally, Gusfield (1989) rationalizes the importance of rhetorical criticism from a perspective in which critical analysis is best when a critic is willing to understand that language has layered meanings and that there are multiple ways in which language
directs our attention. Specifically, words and phrases have both connotative and denotative meanings, which are described by Burke as poetic and semantic meanings, respectively. Thus, using all layers of meaning that exist for language makes rhetorical criticism best, according to Gusfield:

Burke, then, points us toward the multiple, polysemic meanings of actions. In seeing symbolic attributes, he prompts us to go beyond a single interpretation of actions. In adopting the utilitarian paradigm as the only source of orderly understanding, the observer will miss much of how events and objects are involved in the common experience of a social group. Both the poetic and the semantic meanings are required if we are to see very far. (p. 31)

Burke’s discussion of poetic and semantic meanings is especially important. Burke discusses the poetic meaning as the connotative meaning of a term and the semantic meaning as the denotative meaning. He believes that a critic must look beyond the semantic (or denotative) meaning of a term if s/he is to understand how that term operates in a particular discourse. Therefore, although adoption’s legal (and thus semantic) meaning is clear and fixed, its social (or poetic) meaning is less obvious. It is only when a critic is willing to uncover both the semantic and poetic meaning that a term is ever truly understood.

Additionally, rhetorical criticism provides scholars a way to understand more than just a text itself. Instead, it allows me to understand a term across multiple texts, thus enabling me to utilize a positional perspective of criticism. This perspective, according to Condit (1993), allows the critic to focus on broad shifts of language usages throughout history. She explains that “if language has substance [as Burke claims it does], then the coming and going of different terms as guides for a collectivity is of significance” (p. 211). Therefore, I analyzed the language within texts as well as the language across
texts. This analysis was confined to a ten-year time period, starting January 1, 1993 (the year of the Baby Jessica adoption case), and ending December 31, 2003. My analysis of adoption discourse began with the notion that there is a public vocabulary about adoption and attempts to uncover that vocabulary. Additionally, Burke’s ideas about cluster analysis, representative anecdotes, and terministic catharsis are discussed and evaluated.

Public vocabulary

The way in which adoption is discussed in the media has a profound impact on the way in which the public talks about the subject. Condit (1990) defines the public in a specific way, as “[t]he social formation constituted through the interests and voices of all ‘active’ or potentially active members of a social group” (p. 228). She furthers this definition by arguing that the dominant elite are typically the most active subset and that “the people” is the identity of people that follow the dominant leader or leader-system.

Additionally, Condit explains the importance of the public discourse:

In public arenas of discourse—such as newspapers, magazines, the floor of Congress, presidential speeches, television programs, or bureaucratic hearings—rhetors advance claims on “the nation” couched in terms of major values, suggesting that particular sentiments, policies, or laws are in the general interest. To the extent that they are successful at convincing the [ ]public of this potential for general good, they are able to enact their will. However, the process of convincing requires not only that a given policy be accepted but also that a given vocabulary (or set of understandings) be integrated into the public repertoire. (p. 6)

In other words, Condit explains that the public develops a shared vocabulary about a particular issue based on the way in which that issue is talked about in the public discourse. Unsurprisingly, most of the public discourse is propagated by powerful social and economic groups that are able to define the subject and create the vocabulary that is
then accepted by the public as a whole, a vocabulary that is distributed via newspapers and magazines across the country. Although adoption policy equates adopted children with biological children, a vocabulary that does the same thing has not yet been integrated into the public discourse.

Ultimately, Condit (1990) argues that the public vocabulary can change over time and that those changes are important to recognize:

Public discourse is an active, change-producing, transformative process, not merely a passive conveyer belt... Charting the changes in the units of discourse that appear in a controversy across time and relating these changes to the general and specific forces of rhetoric can produce better explanations of the processes that operate to bring about the particular forms that social change take. (p. 11)

In relation to this thesis, taking a snapshot of the changes in adoption discourse across texts and across time allow us to gain a better understanding of the poetic (or connotative) meaning of adoption in relation to its semantic (or denotative) meaning.

In his book, The Philosophy of Literary Form, Burke (1973) argues that there are both semantic meanings and poetic meanings of terms and that the two meanings differ:

The semantic ideal would attempt to get a description by the elimination of attitude. The poetic ideal would attempt to attain a full moral act by attaining a perspective atop all the conflicts of attitude. The first would try to cut away, to abstract, all emotional factors that complicate the objective clarity of meaning. The second would try to derive its vision from the maximum heaping up of all these emotional factors, playing them off against one another, inviting them to reinforce and contradict one another, and seeking to make this active participation itself a major ingredient of the vision. (pp. 147-148)

Charting the meaning of adoption gives us the appropriate resources to determine how the public rhetorically constructs adoption. McGee (1982) uses the term "rhetoric" as an example term, when he attempts to describe how terms change across texts and across time. Ultimately, with his example, he explains that the term rhetoric has resisted
change. Sloop (2004) enhances McGee’s notion by stating “McGee’s claims were perhaps most significant when one was focusing not on terms like ‘rhetoric’ but instead on words used in everyday life and public argument that have political implications for how people organize identities, hierarchies, and understandings of the human condition” (p. 19). In terms of this research, the public discussion of adoption has implications for the way in which we understand adoption. Therefore, it is important to uncover how adoption has entered our public vocabulary repertoire and to understand the vocabulary that provides adoption’s meaning in the public’s view.

Cluster analysis

In order to determine the associations that infuse adoption’s meaning both within and across texts, cluster analysis was performed on the representative texts of adoption discourse. Burke (1969) explains that the best way to understand the meaning of a term is to uncover the meanings of the terms surrounding it. Specifically, he says that “[t]o tell what a thing is, you place it in terms of something else. This idea of locating, or placing, is implicit in our very word for definition itself: to define, or determine a thing, is to mark its boundaries, hence to use terms that possess, implicitly at least, contextual reference” (p. 24). This discussion of how we define terms is the basis for Burke’s notion of clusters. He argues that because we understand a term based on other terms, it is possible to chart the other terms to determine what a particular term means (poetically and semantically) to a particular rhetor or a public.

For example, since I want to determine the meaning of adoption in public discourse, Burke argues that I need to look at places where adoption occurs in the public
discourse and find out what words surround adoption. Once I determine what words envelop adoption, I can begin to understand what adoption means both poetically/connotatively and semantically/denotatively. This is especially important with the study of adoption because if the earlier research cited about adoption stigma is true, the public (poetic) meaning of adoption is very different from the legal (semantic) meaning of adoption.

The utility of Burke's distinction between semantic and poetic meaning can be found in the public discourse surrounding adoption. Semantically, adoption means a legal process in which an individual or individuals are given parental rights over a minor. Poetically, adoption means many things, including that adoption is noble, but also that it is distinct from biological families. Because the poetic meaning of adoption takes on a variety of forms, stigma surrounding adoption is able to reside in this unresolved and somewhat conflicted poetic meaning of adoption.

Given the subtle variations of meanings of terms like adoption, cluster analysis helps focus our attention on the poetic meaning of a particular term. In fact, Burke argues that one way to understand those multiple meanings is to perform cluster analysis. Burke (1973) explains the concept of cluster analysis by saying: “the work of every writer contains a set of implicit equations. He [sic] uses ‘associational clusters.’ And you may, by examining his work, find ‘what goes with what’ in these clusters--what kinds of acts and images and personalities and situations go with his notions of heroism, villainy, consolation, despair, etc.” (p. 20). Burke theorizes that clusters can be found in relation to the finished text that a critic is using. However, if McGee (1999) is correct,
contemporary criticism is comprised of fragments rather than a single finished text. Therefore, instead of charting a single rhetor's clusters, a critic can chart a society's clusters in order to determine the public vocabulary repertoire. Although little research has been done to construct the theoretical underpinnings of cluster analysis, there are arguably three (or four, as discussed later) types of clusters that one may find in any set of texts: associational clusters, oppositional (or agonistic) clusters, and transitive clusters.

First, associational clusters are those described by Burke in the previous paragraph; a critic finds "what goes with what" in order to determine what words have an association with other words. Burke (1961) states that a critic must note "what subjects cluster about other subjects (what images b, c, d the [rhetor] introduces whenever he [sic] talks with engrossment of a)" (p. 232). Foss (2004) and other rhetorical scholars like Cooks & Descutner (1993) and Crowell (1977) typically talk about associational clusters when they discuss cluster analysis; however, they tend to ignore the other types of clusters Burke identified. More specifically, Cooks & Descutner (1993) looked at spiritual recovery therapy discourse to identify clusters of power, identity, and body across the discourse. Similarly, Crowell (1977) examines Burke's own uses of sheer throughout his writing. As she examines his use of the term, she also describes how sheer clusters with terms including discrimination, change, uncertainty, completion, and whimsicality. Both Cooks & Descutner and Crowell provide excellent examples of associational cluster analyses.

In addition to these cluster analyses, other scholars have engaged in the analysis of both associational and oppositional clusters (Berthold, 1976; Lee & Campbell, 1994;
Mechling & Mechling, 1983). Oppositional clusters are described by Burke (1973) as "what is vs. what" (p. 69). Burke argues that oppositional clusters create equations to show that the terms are in opposition to one another. He states that critics who wish to propose oppositional clusters should understand that "if we want to say that one principle equals 'light,' and the other equals 'darkness,' we must be able to extract this interpretation by explicit quotation from the work itself" (p. 69). In other words, the equations must be textually grounded rather than externally imposed in order to qualify as clusters.

Perhaps the most complete agonistic cluster analysis to date was written by Berthold (1976). She examines Kennedy's rhetoric to understand Kennedy's ultimate (or "god") term of freedom. At that point, she determined the terms that cluster with freedom, including peace, strength, unity, and defense. She also found the terms that were in opposition to freedom and thus were agon clusters. These terms included communism and war.

Third, and finally, transitive clusters, which are never labeled as such by Burke, are described by Burke (1973) as "from what through what to what" (p. 71). Burke explains that clusters that show "from what through what to what" (which he calls arrows) are distinguishable from clusters that involve "what equals what" (which he calls equations). Burke states that "although there are many borderline cases where we might employ either the sign of equation or the sign of sequence, for charting a narrative sequence, the most convenient design is obviously 'event A → event B → event C,' etc." (p. 75). Clearly, although not labeled as transitive clusters, Burke shows the difference
between oppositional and transitive clusters and asserts that oppositional clusters allow one to use a term versus another term whereas transitive clusters require a sequential pattern.

Rueckert (2001) breaks the transitive cluster down further, dividing it into two parts that he believes Burke separated in his own analysis when writing an essay on Ethan Brand (Burke, 1952). He names these two parts progressions and transformations. Rueckert defines the progression cluster as “what follows what” and the transformation as “what becomes what.” Both of these clusters are options to get to the overarching transitive cluster of “from what through what to what.” Ultimately, the distinction between them is that with progression clusters, the two things remain distinct and with the transformation clusters, a thing travels by stages to become something different than when alone. For example, in his essay “‘Ethan Brand’: A Preparatory Investigation,” Burke (1952) identifies both a progression cluster and a transformation cluster.

Burke’s (1952) identification of a progression cluster occurs with his analysis of pictures that were recovered:

What, then, should we make of the fact that, as the exhibit proceeds, it is obscenely sullied by “a gigantic, brown (there it comes to fruition) hairy hand (hand? The guilty hand?), --which might have been mistaken for the Hand of Destiny, though, in truth, was only the showman’s.” Now, is not this the point of the within-the-within? Is not this a show-within-a-show? Hence, have we not by progression arrived at essence now? (p. 51-52)

Burke outlines the progression from the “show” to the “show-within-a-show” in order to explain how the clusters progressed within the text he was studying.
On the other hand, transformation clusters show how something becomes something different throughout the analysis. In the same essay, Burke (1952) identifies an example of the transformation cluster:

Ethan clearly equates the Unpardonable Sin with intellect, as contrasted with the heart. But intellect also means climbing in the specifically careerist sense, from "unlettered laborer" to "star-lit eminence." It was such "progress" that "disturbed the counterpoise between his mind and heart." The reflexive element figures, in that such separation from the "universal throb" equals the "self-pursuing." In sum: "Ethan Brand became a fiend." (p. 55)

In this example, Burke identifies how the terms utilized in the text actually allowed Ethan Brand to become something different, and thus transform through the clusters infused within the text.

Clearly, authors have performed cluster analyses through the examination of both associational and oppositional clusters. However, only Gaber (1986), doctoral student at Bowling Breen State University, analyzes all three ways in which words cluster. In her dissertation, she examines the rhetoric of Minister Louis Farrakhan and the ways in which his most utilized terms cluster with other terms. Although she doesn’t break transitive clusters down into two parts like Rueckert, she at least acknowledges that the transitive cluster is a possibility in discourse.

The three (or four, if you agree with Rueckert’s analysis) types of clusters that exist within texts can be analyzed using what Burke calls “quantitative” methods. Burke’s use of the term “quantitative” is different than the way social scientists use it. Burke was annoyed at the prevalence of “statistical data” and the importance of “quantitative” research; therefore, he used these terms to describe his procedures, despite
the fact that his method relies solely on examining clusters in a qualitative manner that can be quantified numerically.

Burke's (1973) description of the procedure utilized for cluster analysis is as follows: “First: We should watch for the dramatic alignment. What is vs. what” (p. 69). Second, he explains that “[w]e may, eventually, offer ‘generalizations atop generalizations’ whereby different modes of concrete imagery may be classed together” (p. 70). Finally, Burke outlines how to complete a cluster analysis, in which he says “we should watch for ‘critical points’ within the work, as well as at beginnings and endings” (p. 78).

Ultimately, Burke (1973) defends this “method,” by explaining its importance:

To know what “shoe, or house, or bridge” means, you don’t begin with a “symbolist dictionary” already written in advance. You must, by inductive inspection of a given work, discover the particular contexts in which the shoe, house, or bridge occurs. You cannot, in advance, know in what equational structure it will have membership.

By inspection of the work, you propose your description of this equational structure. Your propositions are open to discussion, as you offer your evidence for them and show how much of the plot’s development your description would account for. “Closer approximations” are possible, accounting for more. The method, in brief, can be built upon, in contrast with essentializing strategies of motivation that all begin anew. (p. 89)

Concomitantly, to know what adoption means, you don’t begin with a symbolist dictionary already written in advance. Burke believes that despite the method lacking a scientist orientation, the tracking of clusters is an important way to uncover the meaning of terms in our “equipment for living.”

Additionally, Foss (2004) explains that cluster analysis involves three steps: identifying key terms in the discourse; charting the terms that cluster around the key
terms; and discovering an explanation for the clusters in the discourse. In short, this process requires one to determine what key terms exist within adoption discourse, chart those terms that continue to appear with the key terms, and explain why those terms cluster together. Similar to Burke's explanation, Foss asserts that clusters can be "counted" and analyzed to determine the importance of certain terms in the discourse.

Although most of Burke's (1969) discussion about clusters involves the way in which such terms can be "charted," it is important to note that Burke understood that there could be truncated clusters, or clusters that are in play even though the word isn't used. He says:

Unquestionably, the most prominent philosophic member of this family is "substance." Or at least it used to be, before John Locke greatly impaired its prestige, so that many thinkers today explicitly banish the term from their vocabularies. But there is cause to believe that, in banishing the term, far from banishing its functions one merely conceals them. Hence, from the dramatistic point of view, we are admonished to dwell upon the word, considering its embarrassments and its potentialities of transformation, so that we may detect its covert influence even in cases where it is overtly absent. (p. 21)

In other words, a term that isn't even mentioned in a particular discourse can still be operating as a cluster within that discourse.

For example, Lakoff (2003) argues that the way in which conservatives describe taxes amounts to a truncated cluster. Conservatives discuss taxes in terms of tax relief and by doing so, use terms such as "burden" and "affliction" without ever saying the words. Taxes are treated as a burden, and thus when the government provides tax relief, they are providing relief from a burden, despite the fact that no one ever has to use the word burden. This is a perfect example of Burke's description of truncated clusters, in
which a term still influences another term, even if it never directly appears in the
discourse.

**Locating representative anecdotes**

In *A Grammar of Motives*, Burke (1969b) describes his “method” of dramatism
and argues that the best way to do dramatistic analysis is by searching for representative
anecdotes:

Dramatism suggests a procedure to be followed in the development of a given
calculus, or terminology. It involves the search for a “representative anecdote,” to
be used as a form in conformity with which the vocabulary is constructed... A
given calculus must be supple and complex enough to be representative of the
subject-matter it is designed to calculate. It must have scope. Yet it must also
possess simplicity, in that it is broadly a reduction of the subject matter. (pp. 59-
60)

Therefore, Burke argues that instead of analyzing an entire text (text, in this case, is used
fluidly), a critic can identify a representative anecdote of that text and analyze only that
representative anecdote, which can then be generalized to the entire text.

Madsen (1993), then assistant professor at the University of Pittsburgh, explains
that the representative anecdote, discussed by Burke, is an anecdote that sums up the
essence of a text. Brummett (1984a), then associate professor of Speech Communication
at Purdue University, continues this explanation by stating that in order to find a
representative anecdote, a critic must ask “‘if this discourse were based upon a story, an
anecdote, what would the form, outline, or bare bones of that story be’?” (p. 163). In
other words, the critic is asked to find an anecdote that in and of itself describes the
information that exists about a subject across the subject’s discourse.
Although Brummett’s (1984a) description of a representative anecdote is accurate, his application of the representative anecdote as a critical method is not. In his essay where he applies the representative anecdote to evangelical rhetoric, Brummett (1984b) determines that there is a representative anecdote “underlying [evangelical] rhetoric” (p. 8). He uncovers this anecdote because he views the anecdote as a method used by a critic to understand a text; unfortunately, Burke (1973) specifically explains that the critic “must be able to extract interpretation by explicit quotation from the work itself” (p. 69). In other words, Burke believes the representative anecdote must be able to be discovered in the text, rather than the critic representing the essence of the text with an anecdote. Additionally, Burke (1969) argues that “representation” is synonymous with “synecdoche,” which he defines as “part for the whole, whole for the part, container for the contained, sign for the thing signified” (p. 507). Brummett’s read of Burke does not conform to Burke’s notion that a representative anecdote must synecdochically represent the text. Despite Brummett’s view, I ascribe to Burke’s original notion of the representative anecdote for my analysis.

Although Brummett’s (1984b) analysis is different from Burke’s (1969) description and Madsen’s (1993) method, other scholars followed his interpretation of how to use representative anecdotes as a critical method (Harter & Japp, 2001; Prosise & Johnson, 2004; Scodari, 1987; Smith, 1987; Smith & Golden, 1988). Perhaps the most obvious use comes from Smith & Golden (1988) in their analysis of the 1984 North Carolina senate race between Jesse Helms and James Hunt. They explain their analysis as a “metaphoric approach to anecdotal analysis” (p. 244) and ultimately find that Jesse
Helms used a “Soap Opera” anecdote throughout his discourse. Interestingly, Helms himself never utilized a term remotely similar to “Soap Opera” in his discourse, thus proving how Smith & Golden superimposed such an anecdote into the discourse. Prosise & Johnson (2004), although relying on Brummett’s (1984b) analysis, at least acknowledge Madsen’s (1993) critique of Brummett. In the end, though, their analysis focuses on Brummett’s interpretation of the critical method.

Despite the studies that have focused on the representative anecdote, Crable (2000), assistant professor in the Communication Department at Villanova University, argues that the representative anecdote is not a critical method outlined by Burke, but rather an orientation to prove why dramatistic analysis is superior to other methods. He writes:

I suggest that Burke is not offering a critical method as much as developing a concept that allows him to claim dramatism’s superiority as an approach to motives... In sum, the representative anecdote supports Burke’s claim to provide the most adequate vocabulary for the study of motives... At this broadest level, “representative anecdote” is understood as a way to unify otherwise-disconnected bits of discourse. It is taken to be a basic narrative structure shared by the texts under a critic’s gaze. (pp. 318-319)

In other words, Crable believes Burke uses the representative anecdote as a general descriptive term that doesn’t require a specific method to be developed around it. Although this viewpoint is perfectly legitimate, I argue that the representative anecdote can serve both as a way to “unify otherwise-disconnected bits of discourse” and as a critical method to analyze a specific discourse. Ultimately, there is no reason that both Crable and Madsen cannot be correct.
Representative anecdotes are significant to this thesis primarily because it is impractical to think I can analyze thousands of articles individually. Therefore, in order to do a complete cluster analysis of adoption discourse, it is important to use representative anecdotes. In this thesis, I took articles written about adoption in the media and analyzed them to determine which pieces constituted representative examples of the clusters of adoption across the media.

This analysis had the potential to uncover three types of representation: first, the texts could have revealed overarching themes. In this case, several articles could be selected to represent the development of that overall theme. Second, parts of the theme might have changed across time. If this occurred, one or two articles from different periods would be selected to represent that change. Third, multiple themes might co-exist. In this case, an article or several articles from each theme would be selected as representative anecdotes of the theme and then further analyzed. Ultimately, my analysis produced the third scenario, in which multiple themes co-exist in adoption discourse. Thus, several articles from each theme were selected as representative anecdotes and analyzed further.

There is an important distinction between Madsen’s (1993) description of representative anecdotes and my employment of them in this thesis. Madsen argues that the anecdote sums up the essence of a text. The assumption here is that a small part of a text will represent the larger text. However, my analysis uses text in a fluid manner. Within adoption discourse, I am not looking for the representative anecdote embedded in a finished, complete text. Rather, I am drawing from McGee’s (1999) notion of
fragments to argue that each article in the public discourse is only a fragment of the larger text of adoption discourse as a whole. Therefore, it is my proposition that an article can be analyzed as a representative anecdote that represents a story unfolding across multiple texts.

In this thesis, finding representative anecdotes requires me to determine which articles are representative of the larger trends in public discourse. Three criteria have been established for representation by Madsen (1993). First, he argues that the anecdote must reflect human action. Burke draws a distinction between symbolic acts, which reflect human action because humans are symbol-users, and anecdotes that “reflect motion, determinism, or physical relationships” (Madsen, 1993, p. 213). Second, the anecdote must possess adequate scope. The anecdote “must be supple and complex enough to be representative of the subject matter it is designed to calculate” (Burke, 1969, p. 60). Third, the anecdote must represent the text in its entirety. Balthrop (1975) explains this by saying “each act within the anecdote will share the essence of the broader scope of acts constrained within the text” (p. 3).

Using Madsen’s (1993) criteria for selecting representative anecdotes, I categorized the clusters I found across adoption discourse and then looked for articles that wholly represented a particular set of articles within a cluster. I then took relevant quotations from the representative article in order to create representative anecdotes of the cluster as a whole. Through this process, a series of quotations from the texts allowed me to provide representative anecdotes of the various clusters that existed within
adoption discourse. The criterion for representative anecdotes was important in order to ensure that I did not superimpose an anecdote into the text, as discussed by Madsen.

Madsen (1993) concludes that representative anecdotes also have an important benefit to researchers. He argues that the representative anecdote “can serve as a corrective to the critic’s own analysis” (p. 225). In other words, the representative anecdote serves as an independent way to determine if the critic’s cluster analysis was truly representative. More specifically, Madsen explains that “[i]f the details of the text are inconsistent with the anecdote derived from the hierarchical arrangement of textual principles, the critic has conducted a valuable test of his or her approach to criticism and can subsequently move the analysis to a more representative interpretation” (pp. 225-226).

This potential ability to determine whether or not the cluster analysis performed was valid is especially important to my work, since I must be able to defend my analysis and the choices that guided that analysis. If Madsen’s (1993) conclusion is correct, I can go back through the clusters I found in adoption discourse and make sure the representative anecdotes I chose truly represent the details of the texts that fall within each cluster. This extra step allows me to present my results from both the cluster analysis and the representative anecdote selection with more confidence.

Terministic catharsis

Because Burke believes that language matters and that the words we use to surround a term determine what that term ultimately means, it is possible for terms to take on new meanings in public discourse. For example, in my study of adoption
discourse, I was able to determine the words and phrases that cluster around the term adoption. In addition to charting those clusters, though, it is possible to take the analysis one step further and determine whether or not the term adoption is changing in public discourse.

More specifically, Burke explains the notion of terministic catharsis by drawing a distinction between the scientist's view and the dramatistic view. Burke (1966) states:

Accordingly, whereas the scientist's emphasis spontaneously, almost automatically, begins with problems of the direct relation between the verbal sign and its corresponding nonverbal referent, a Dramatistic approach to the analysis of language starts with problems of terministic catharsis (which is another word for "rebirth," transcendence, transubstantiation, or simply for "transformation" in the sense of the technically developmental, as when a major term is found somehow to have moved on, and thus to have in effect changed its nature either by adding new meanings to its old nature, or by yielding place to some other term that henceforth takes over its functions wholly or in part). (p. 367)

In other words, a terministic catharsis or "rebirth" of a term occurs when the term shifts over a period of time. Palczewski (2001), then associate professor at the University of Northern Iowa, uses pornography as an example of terministic catharsis by explaining that when a major term moves on and/or develops new meanings, it has undergone a terministic catharsis.

Although Burke argues that the analysis of language starts with problems of terministic catharsis, he does not explain the concept in more detail. Additionally, although Palczewski (2001) uses the term terministic catharsis as a way to describe the way in which pornography discourse has changed over time, very few other scholars have labeled their analysis as a study of terministic catharsis, despite the fact that many of the studies track precisely that. For example, in Decoding Abortion Rhetoric, Condit (1990)
traces the changes in abortion discourse from the 1960s through the 1980s. Additionally, in *Crafting Equality*, Condit and Lucaites (1993) survey the changing meaning of equality in America.

Ultimately, Palczewski (2001), Condit (1990), and Condit and Lucaites (1993) examine the shifting of terms over a significant period of time. Therefore, it is important to note that a critic cannot simply look at a term and how it is deployed in one or two settings to determine if a terministic catharsis is occurring. Rather, a critic must look at the subtle uses of the term across a wide array of public discourse. Thus, the current study examines the public discourse on adoption across a ten year period to determine whether or not the meaning of adoption is undergoing a terministic catharsis.

**Conclusion**

There is little doubt that Americans understand the semantic (legal) meaning of adoption; however, its poetic (public) meaning is ever-changing, and thus requires us to examine closely the way in which adoption is discussed in public discourse. With a solid heuristic vocabulary to describe my critical method, I was able to analyze adoption discourse to begin to understand adoption's poetic meaning. Cluster analysis, according to Burke, helps a critic uncover what goes with what, what is in opposition to what, and what becomes what. In reality, his discussion about clusters is an excellent way to determine the poetic meaning of a particular term. More specifically, the terms that appear with adoption ultimately impact the poetic meaning of adoption. Therefore, cluster analysis is beneficial to the process of uncovering adoption's meaning and explaining why the social stigma persists despite legal changes in adoption policy.
Additionally, Burke’s creation of the idea of a representative anecdote has a profound impact on my analysis. It is impossible to think that I can discuss each article on adoption over a ten-year period and do deep, textual analysis of them all. Since that is not possible, using Burke’s notion of a representative anecdote allowed me to pick representative articles or parts of articles that display the characteristics deemed significant during the cluster analysis phase. Although all articles that contain such clusters are cited appropriately, only representative anecdotes were analyzed fully and discussed in the following chapters.

This chapter has explored the method I employed in order to complete my critical analysis of adoption discourse. By relying heavily on a heuristic vocabulary in which my method emerged from my data, focusing on uncovering clusters and representative anecdotes, and looking for a terministic catharsis in adoption discourse, I was able to complete my critical analysis. Chapter 3 explores the clusters that both positively and negatively affect the poetic meaning of adoption including the biologization of adoption, the replacement/erasure of the word adoption, and a focus on the parents. Chapter 4 discusses the cluster of the commodification of adoption, which has a significantly negative effect on the poetic meaning of adoption. Together, these two chapters prove that, although the semantic meaning of adoption may be fixed, the poetic meaning is unsettled.
CHAPTER 3

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE MEANINGS OF ADOPTION

In a variety of ways, the public tends to glorify adoption, but only in the abstract. Stories about famous adoptees such as Dave Thomas (owner of Wendy's), ad campaigns for adoptable children, and made for TV movies about adoption highlight how Americans can participate in helping a child in need. Despite public proclamations of praise for adoption, the word adoption still carries a stigma, as outlined in Chapter 1. Therefore, the important question now is: is that stigma present in adoption discourse? And if it is present, how is this stigma maintained? I argue that although we tend to talk about adoption in a positive light, the words and phrases that cluster around this positive portrayal of adoption ultimately stigmatize members of the adoptive triad, while at the same time, allowing us to continue to think positively about adoption in the abstract.

Media reporting both reflects and influences public perceptions of events (Littlejohn, 2002). Thus, to get a sense of what drives the continued stigmatization of adoption, I studied media reports of adoption during the ten years following the Baby Jessica case. The analysis of these articles produced several interesting clusters, which will be discussed in detail. These clusters include the biologization of adoption, replacing the word adoption, a focus on the parents, biology versus adoption, and the commondification of adoption. The first four clusters will be analyzed in this chapter and the final cluster will be detailed in Chapter 4.
The Biologization of Adoption

Across adoption discourse, there is a presumption that biology is destiny. Therefore, in order to portray adoption as “normal” and “real,” the words and phrases that cluster around adoption are primarily terms that derive their meaning from biology. In other words, the way in which adoptive families are discussed as real families is through the use of biological terms. Primarily, the associational clusters that appear with adoption in terms of biology occur in four ways: the adoptees' looks; the adoption process as a birthing process; the faith component in biology; and the inherent unbreakable bond between adoptees and their biological parents.

The first set of clusters that appear in adoption discourse focuses on the looks of the adoptee. Both journalists and adoptive parents explain that an important factor for adoptive families is that the adoptees “match” the adoptive parents (Adams, 1996; Bell, 2001; “Black Children,” 1993; Castaneda, 1996; Ellerton, 1996; Fein, 1998; Garcia, 1998; Harrison, 1995; Haynes, 1994; Jerome, 2002; Lewin, 1998a; Lewin, 1998b; Mansnerus, 1998; “Multi-Colored Families,” 1999; Singer, 1998; Stewart, 1995; Van Ekelenburg, 1993). For example, Haynes (1994) describes the importance of “matching” in the story of Dr. Laura Cameron and her daughter:

"It was a spectacular match," the 44-year-old mother says of her special relationship with her daughter, Samiel, who is now 3 1/2 years old. "I couldn't have had a child who looks and behaves more like me and my family. I have to remind myself that she came to me in the way that she did. She was born from the heart and not from the womb.” (para. 11)
Not only was Haynes able to report about the importance of matching adopted children with their adoptive parents, but an adoptive mother concurred with the notion that such a match was important to her.

Second, in addition to the word “match” getting used, it is also important to notice the phrase “who looks and behaves more like me and my family.” By the end of the passage, Dr. Cameron’s language choices make it seem as if she needed a child who looked like her in order to be able to parent effectively, which is why their similarities resulted in a “spectacular match.” The discourse suggests that adoptive parents will be happier with their child if the child has similar biological traits to the parents. Such phrasing acknowledges the superiority of relationships that are bound by biology but also attempts to explain that inferior relationships can be equally as valid, especially if the relationship can “pass” as a biological one (i.e., the child “looks and behaves more like me”).

Additionally, discussions about adoption are talked about in explicit biological terms, such as womb, birth, born, “have had,” and nine-month bond (Barboza, 2003; Crabb, 1998; Davey, 2003; Haynes, 1993; Haynes, 1994; Jerome, 2000; Jones, 1993; Lombardi, 2003; Plummer, 1993; Seelye, 1997). The previous passage from Dr. Cameron exemplifies how we talk about adoption by relating it to biology (Haynes, 1994, para. 11). Specifically, she states, “I couldn’t have had a child who looks and behaves more like me” and “[s]he was born from the heart [emphasis added].” These statements from an adoptive mother sound positive; in fact, it is possible that she is attempting to justify her adoptive status by making such comments. However, even though the
overarching idea is a positive one, the way in which the mother is able to make her relationship to her daughter positive is to couch it in biological terms. In other words, since most of us are able to relate to biological families, adoption discourse attempts to identify with the American audience by using biological terms as a way to portray non-biological families.

Third, the focus on faith helps audiences identify with adoption discourse through biological means. The commonly held belief is that God created both man and woman so that the two could procreate and thus continue populating this earth with men and women. When biological reproduction is impossible, many rationalize this as something God wanted. Therefore, in order to make non-biological families consistent with the wishes of the God in which most believe, the discourse focuses on God’s wish to create a family for a set of parents and a child, all of whom are in need of such a family in order to complete themselves individually.

This discussion of adoption as God’s way of creating a family is described in several ways throughout adoption discourse (Castaneda, 1996; Doniger, 2002b; Fagan, 1997; Gonzalez, 1996; Haynes, 1994; Jerome, 2000; Jerome, 2002; Melvin, 2000; Moore, 2002; Plummer, 2001; Poole, 2002; Whetstone, 1994). Whetstone (1994) interviewed the White family about their adoptive daughter and received this response from the mother: “I’m not sad that we didn’t have biological children,’ she says. ‘I am just ever so convinced that… Alexis is the baby that God sent us. He used a different messenger to get her here, but I feel strongly that she is the baby that we would have had’” (para. 13). This passage includes several interesting moves to biologize adoption
discussed previously (such as the explicit use of biological terms and the reference to God), but also focuses heavily on the “different messenger” that helped to create this family. If an adoptive family is the route God has chosen for a set of parents and a child, then it is clearly an appropriate and worthy family. Additionally, the portrayal that parents are “destined” to have a certain child, regardless of whether or not that child is biological or adopted, reinforces a commonly held American belief in the idea of fate.

The anecdote describing the importance of faith is also interesting because of its subtle references to biology. “He used a different messenger to get her here” is in direct conflict with the typical messenger of biological mother or stork (para. 13). The parent notes also that “she is the baby that we would have had,” thus reinforcing the fact that biology does matter (para. 13). Ultimately, the argument purported is one in which adoption can be equated to biological families because both are God’s wish for a specific person and God never fails. Additionally, had God chosen the biological route instead of the adoptive one, the same child would have ended up with the same parents. Although this may sound somewhat idealistic, it is a simple concept that the audience can easily grasp.

The final way in which adoption clusters around words and phrases associated with biology occurs in the context of adoptees who are forever connected to their biological ties. Such words and phrases include “ties to birth,” “someone else’s child,” “searching is part of one’s destiny,” and “a sense of loss” for adoptees (“A Search,” 1996; “Adopted Koreans,” 1999; Badie, 2003b; Castaneda, 1996; Charles, 1998; Charles, 2000; Heyman, 2003; James, 1997; Jerome, 2000; Kim, 2000; Lewin, 1998a; Luscombe,
1997; Marech, 2000; Mason, 1999; McBride, 1996; Meyers, 1997; Oliverio, 2003; Purvis, 1997; Reilly, 2000; Rosenberg, 1999; Sanz, 1993; Saunders, 1997; Speidel, 1995; "True Romance," 1995; Williams, 1995). More specifically, loss is a component that is discussed as part of the adoption process (Charles, 1998; Charles, 2000; Cheakalos, 2002; Kim, 2000; Marech, 2000; Reilly, 2000; Saunders, 1997; Speidel, 1995; "True Romance," 1995; Williams, 1995). Saunders (1997) argues that adoptive families need special psychological treatment because members of an adoptive family have a special set of issues that include a child’s struggle to cope with loss and his or her own identity as an adopted child. Saunders further explains the relationship between adoption and loss:

"It is profound, even primal," said Whitworth. "There's an inborn sense of loss, and it's not something a parent can fix or change. You just have to learn to comfort and cry with them. Let them grieve and ask questions." (para. 8)

In this passage, adoption is equated with loss. In fact, the passage is explicit in saying that it is an “inborn” sense of loss and that “it’s not something a parent can fix.” These phrases ultimately mean that loss is part of the adoption process and this description means that it is natural for adoptees to feel loss and to grieve over that loss, even when they are infants. The association between adoption and loss ultimately biologizes families because adoptees “lose” their biological connection. In fact, without this description, there is no reason that children would feel loss; such loss only occurs when someone tells them they now have less. In other words, equating loss to adoption in the discourse means that adoptees are told they have lost something and thus should experience loss.
The words and phrases that are clustering with adoption include the "matching" of children and families, the equation of adoption to the birthing process, the faith component, and the continued biological connection to the biological parents. All four of these sets of clusters help us understand how adoption is understood through biological terms. Since biology is destiny, the only way to make adoption part of that destiny is to describe its similarities to biology through biological terms. This reliance of biology as destiny is important because even the most dysfunctional of biological families are still considered families. Because of this, biology determines what a family is, instead of that determination depending upon relational love.

This is significant because if biology wasn't the standard by which we measured a family, it would open up the door to all types of families, instead of keeping the focus on nuclear families. This would be problematic in our current culture, which places a strong emphasis on family values and continues to take steps to try to encourage a "traditional family model" by opposing the legal recognition of LGBT families. In fact, in her discussion of family values, Dana Cloud (1998), then assistant professor at the University of Texas, Austin, explains that during the 1992 presidential campaign, family values operated as "an ideograph that offered a utopian return to a mythic family ideal even as it scapegoated private families--especially those headed by single parents, racial minorities, and the poor--for structural social problems" (p. 411). Unfortunately, our current culture of describing families and family values still relies upon our own view of the "1950s traditional family," and thus makes it difficult for us to consider widening our view of the family.
Clearly, biology is the standard against which adoptive families are measured. The associations that infuse the meaning of adoption in this discourse tend to focus on the similarities between adoptive families and biological families. Although this may seem logical, since most readers of the discourse come from biological families and thus are able to identify with the adoptive relationship when it is described through biological terms, the move to equate the two is still problematic. By doing so, adoptive parents, children, and their relationships are not talked about as their own end, but rather, as something that moves adoptive families closer to being biological. In other words, the stories never focus on the adoptive family as a family, but rather move the focus of the story away from the adoptive family and into the adoptive family’s similarities to a biological family.

One other interesting insight that develops throughout adoption discourse is that many of the descriptions of adoption through biological terms are presented by adoptive parents. When it comes to describing the importance of children “looking like” their adoptive families, describing the adoption process like the birthing process, and the use of faith to help biologize (or naturalize) adoption, it is typically the adoptive parents who are making such statements in the discourse (Adams, 1996; “Any Loving Family,” 1995; Badie, 2000; Badie, 2002; Boyd & Banger, 1999; Breu & Jewel, 1998; Bruni, 1995; Byrd, 2001; Cheakalos, 2002; Corbett, 2002; Costello & Roberson, 2003; Davenport, 2003; Davey, 2003; Doniger, 2002a; Doniger, 2002b; Egan, 1993; Ellerton, 1996; Fein, 1998; Fink, 1994; Garcia, 1998; Gonzalez, 1996; Goodman, 2000; Greene, 1999; Harris, 1995a; Harris, 1995b; Haynes, 1994; Heredia, 1998; Herscher, 1999; Hill, 1997; Holmes,
1995; Horsburg, 2003; Jacobs, 1997; Jacobs, 2003; Jay, 1996; Jerome, 1999; Jerome, 2000; Jones, 1993; Lipton, 2002; Lombardi, 2003; Louie, 1995; Mason, 1999; McQueen, 2001; McQuiston, 1996; Melvin, 2000; Melvin, 2002; Molonerace & Molonerace, 1993; “Mom’s the Word,” 2000; Moore, 2003; Nakao, 2001; Oglesby, 1996; Oliviero, 2003; Olszewski, 1997; “One Man’s,” 1994; Plummer, 2001; Poole, 2002; Postmarace, 1993; Reilly, 2000; Roberts, 1997a; Roberts, 1997b; Schindehette, 2003; “Scoop,” 2000; Seelye, 1997; Singer, 1998; Smith, 1994; Stewart, 1995; Swarms, 1997; Tauber, 2003; Whetstone Sims, 1996; Whitford, 1995; Yi, 2000). I contend that this move occurs for two reasons: first, because adoptive parents are trying to justify their family to themselves; and second because adoptive parents are attempting to justify their family to the larger community of non-adoptive readers.

First, all of us are taught to understand families through a biological framework, and I believe that such a framework permeates in the adoptive parents’ minds, even when they do not have biological children. Although they may not fully understand the similarities and differences between adopted children and biological children, they attempt to understand their relationship to their child through biological terms, because it is the only measure they have ever known. In the end, no matter how prevalent the debate between nature and nurture is, we all think about nature first, because we understand the science that supports biology. Ultimately, even as the semantic meaning of family expands (especially in legal terms) according to Galvin (2003), we all still poetically frame the family as a biological relationship.
Because adoption is stigmatized, adoptive parents believe they must justify their family and try to break down the stereotype that creates the stigma in the first place. One of the easiest ways to break down this stereotype is to create identification with the larger, non-adoptive audience by using language that helps the audience relate. Therefore, if adoptive parents don’t think non-adoptive readers understand the adoptive family, they can use biological terms to help the readers understand why adoptive families are similar to biological families. In other words, the marginalized parents are attempting to demand recognition from the dominant majority by giving the majority a framework that they can understand. However, in the process of creating that framework, adoptive parents reinforce the biological model of family and thus maintain a narrow definition of the family instead of expanding the definition of family to include other family forms.

Replacing the Word Adoption

In addition to the biologization of adoption, there is also an interesting move in the discourse to replace the word adoption with other words. When I searched newspaper and magazine articles about adoption, the word “adopt” was one of my search terms; therefore, every article has some form of the word “adopt” within the text. Although each article contains some form of “adopt,” it is typically only used sparingly throughout a particular article. Instead of continually referring to adoption as adoption, other words are employed that replace adoption. Ultimately, the replacement of the word adoption with other words creates a significant number of associational clusters because the replacement word then becomes equated to the word adoption. These clusters happen in
three specific ways: first, words to describe the child’s relationship to the adoptive parents are used; second, the adoptive family is describe in specific ways; and finally, adoption gets replaced by “it” without a referent and truncated passives, making “adoption” a “dirty word.”

First, the way in which an adopted child and adoptive parents create a family together is described in ways where the adopted child is “given” to the adoptive family (Adams, 1996; Charles, 1998; Davenport, 2003; Jerome, 2000; “Multi-Colored Families,” 1999; “Scoop,” 2000). Other references include the child “ending up” with the family, being an “addition” to the family, being “brought” home, “arriving” home, “becoming” part of a family; “meeting” a family, being something the parents “came away with,” and being “sent to a family” (Adams, 1996; Badie, 2000; Badie, 2003a; Barboza, 2003; Bell, 2001; Bixler, 2002; Breu & Jewel, 1998; Chamberlain, 1996; Corbett, 2002; Costello & Roberson, 2003; Davenport, 2003; Davey, 2003; Doniger, 2002b; Donsky, 2000; Egan, 1993; Fagan, 1997; Fink, 1994; Gonzalez, 1996; Harris, 1995a; Harris, 1995b; Haynes, 1993; Haynes, 1994; Herscher, 1999; Jacobs, 2003; Lewin, 1998a; McQueen, 2001; McQuiston, 1996; Olszewski, 1996; “One Man’s,” 1994; Poole, 2002; Smolowe, 1994; Stewart, 1995; Torpy, 2002a; Whetstone Sims, 1996; Whetstone, 1994; Whitford, 1995; Zimmerman, 1998a). All of these substitutions for adoption turn adoptees into objects. For example, when a family “brings home” a child, it is as though the family is bringing home an object. The words that replace adoption in the discourse all focus on words that we would use to describe objects. The replacement words and phrases for adoption could easily be that the child was embraced into the
family, made a family, helped constitute a family, or was emotionally connected to the family. By choosing to use words that describe the child as an object, though, adoption is not equated to an emotional integration into a family, but rather as an item that the family now possesses. This is interesting because when we talk about the creation of a biological family, we tend to focus on the bond between parent and child and the emotional and physical connection that immediately exists. By choosing to downplay these aspects with adoptive families in the discourse, and instead focusing on poetic terms that equate children to objects, it makes it easy for the public to forget that these families also share strong emotional connections and are now part of the same family.

The use of terms like children being “brought” home also raises another interesting issue. Many of the phrases that replace adoption rely upon adoption becoming a physical location of a placement. The physical location of a placement is best described in a more general sense by Lakoff & Johnson (1980). They explain that we often use orientational metaphors to describe our situation, which are defined as metaphors that “do[ ] not structure one concept in terms of another but instead organize[ ] a whole system of concepts with respect to one another” (p. 14). Most of these metaphors, according to Lakoff & Johnson, are reliant upon spatial orientation. Additionally, they argue that “our physical and cultural experience provides many possible bases for spatialization metaphors. Which ones are chosen, and which ones are major, may vary from culture to culture” (p. 19). In other words, we create metaphors that describe our spatial location to a particular thing or idea that we are discussing and we talk about that idea using metaphors that rely upon physical location.
The words and phrases extracted above are clear orientational metaphors. They all focus on the physical location of the home, and thus make adoption understandable through that physical location. The significance of this move to spatially locate adoption instead of to locate it emotionally spurs an important distinction: in adoptive families, the family and the home exist prior to the adoption of a child; therefore, the child does not represent a part of the core of a family, but instead simply is added to a preexisting family core. For example, McQueen (2001) reports that “Matthew became a member of the Vroman family a year ago. After learning, on a Web site, about an orphaned toddler, they traveled to China to adopt him. The boy was near death when they brought him home, but he is now a bubbly 3-year-old” (para. 6). In this report, Matthew “became” a member of a family that had already been established and they “brought him home” to a home that had already been established. Because both the family and the home existed prior to Matthew’s arrival, adoption does not make a family or reconstitute a new family (as in the notion that having a child changes everything), but only adds to a preexisting family. Although biological families that have more than one child are sometimes described in similar ways, the descriptions of adoptive families that use the language which assumes home and family are preexisting typically refer to an adoptive child who is the first or only child.

This is especially interesting because of the significant amount of literature that suggests that families are not recognized as families until they include children. Because many adoptions take place because of parent infertility, prior to an adoption, the family consists of just the two parents. In fact, the poetic meaning of family typically involves a
set of parents with a child or children. Even beyond its poetic meaning, recall that Greenstein (2001) reported 98% of survey participants believed a married couple with children constituted a family, but that statistic declined as different variations of the family were proposed. Additionally, Schneider (1980) argues that a family is “a unit which contains a husband and wife and their child or children” (p. 30). Despite the fact that childless couples are not typically defined as a “family,” when it comes to describing adoption, these couples become a family prior to the adoption.

The second way that the word “adoption” is replaced in adoption discourse is in the positive description where adoption becomes synonymous with “lifetime commitment,” “love,” an “intimate” relationship, the “joys of parenthood,” and an alternative to “forgetting” children (Adams, 1996; Blau, 1995; Bruni, 1995; Charles, 1998; Charles, 2000; Cheakalos, 2002; Davenport, 2003; Fagan, 1997; Falkenstein, 2002; Fein, 1998; Fields-Meyer, 2003; Fields-Meyer et al., 1996; Harris, 1995a; Harris, 1995b; Haynes, 1993; Haynes, 1994; Heredia, 1998; Hewitt, 2001; James, 1997; Jerome, 1999; Jerome, 2000; Jerome, 2002; Marech, 2000; McCarthy, 2000; McDonnell, 2000; Meyers, 1997; Moore, 2003; “Online Reunion,” 2000; Poole, 2002; Reilly, 2000; “Russians Checking,” 2000; Sanz, 1993; Schindehette, 2003; Singer, 1998; Speidel, 1995; Whetstone, 1994; Whitford, 1995). In these contexts, adoption becomes a positive act that conjures up images of happy and loving families. Postmarace (1993) uses a variety of phrases that she equates to adoption:

I wanted to live what I believed, not just give lip service to it. I also believed that until we could smudge the boundary between black and white, we would remain forever divided. Adopting a black child would be one way of bringing the races together in the most intimate circumstances, where love and a lifetime
commitment would create at least one tangible tie between the races that would never be broken [emphasis added]. (para. 7)

Postmarace uses “adopting” in the beginning of her account, but then uses other positive words to associate adoption with those terms. The end result is that adoption gets equated with the terms she uses, including “intimate,” “love,” and “lifetime commitment.”

Third, the word adoption is often replaced with “it,” as well as with truncated passives. Both tactics create problems for uncovering the meaning behind adoption. Penelope (1990) describes the inherent problem with the replacement of “adoption” with the word “it” because of the reliance upon a false deixis:

Because deictics require the reader/listener to identify their reference, both it and this are “flag words.” When a deictic has no identifiable referent in the context, it is a false deictic. It points to nothing. False deixis occurs as a result of linguistic ineptness or to implement a rhetorical strategy . . . False deictics make false linguistic claims; they say to readers and hearers, “My use of this deictic word tells you that it points to something in the immediate context of this utterance, and you can easily identify its reference.” (p. 130)

In other words, Penelope claims that when rhetors use “it” without an identifiable referent (either without realizing it or to purposely confuse an audience), they are engaging in a false deixis because the audience is unable to determine what “it” is. Additionally, Penelope explains that often times “it” is referring to a broad reference. She says that “[i]n such phrases, it refers vaguely to something both speaker and hearer believe they already understand. If they do understand such implied references, then they don’t want to say out loud whatever it has replaced” (p. 131).

In adoption discourse, “it” often is used to replace the word “adoption” (“Any Loving Family,” 1995; Badie, 2002; Bell, 2001; “Black Children,” 1993; Breu & Jewel,

"We literally stayed inside the whole week," Mr. Pitkowsky said. "We literally didn't talk. It was devastating. I was worried my wife might do something stupid if she miscarried again."

That loss led the Pitkowskys [sic] to a decision. It was not what they thought they wanted. But it turned out to be a fine solution, for it provided them with the family they wanted, with children they love. After much study, they flew to Honduras and came away with a baby girl. Four years later they traveled to the Dominican Republic, where they met their second baby daughter [emphasis added]. (para. 42-43)

In this passage, "it" gets employed in several places. First, Mr. Pitkowsky says that "it was devastating," which seems to be referring to their infertility. Then, Stewart says "it was not what they thought they wanted," in which "it" is referring to "a decision." Then,
Stewart says “it turned out to be a fine solution,” which is also referring to “a decision.” Finally, she says “it provided them with the family they wanted,” again referring to the decision. By the end of the passage, there is no doubt that “it” refers to “a decision” and that “a decision” refers to adoption, although no where in the passage is the word adoption used.

Clearly, “it” gets used in adoption discourse as a way to replace the word adoption. Unfortunately, Penelope (1990) explains the harm that comes with such a replacement: “As I introduce larger portions of discourse, readers will sense how false deictics sound euphemistic, as though there’s something the speaker considers too personal, too unpleasant or ‘nasty’ to mention out loud. Such uses are a species of denial, a refusal to name specific actions” (p. 136). In other words, the use of “it” in place of “adoption” signifies that adoption is a “nasty” word.

Penelope discusses how “it” is commonly used to replace rape and domestic violence, which ultimately makes those hear the word “it” feel better about what happened because they aren’t confronted with the actual word. By refusing to acknowledge adoption for what it is and instead using “it” as an acceptable alternative, our language choices prove that the word adoption is an unpleasant word and thus should be avoided. The reduction of adoption into a dirty word only helps to explain why a stigma surrounding adoption still exists.

Beyond the replacement of adoption with “it,” another damaging syntax exists within adoption discourse. Penelope (1990) explains that “English has several ways of omitting agents in sentences, but the most popular syntactic structure is the truncated
passive, so-called because suppressing agency shortens the sentence” (p. 145). She explains that when a rhetor uses a truncated passive, s/he uses a sentence that ignores or suppresses the agent responsible for the act being discussed in the sentence. Penelope uses the following example: “The housewife was raped by five men” (p. 146). In this sentence, the housewife is the object, the verb is “was raped” and the agent is five men. However, she argues that when we use the truncated passive, we suppress the agent; thus, the sentence becomes “[t]he housewife was raped” (p. 146). The five men who committed the rape are effectively suppressed from the discussion and thus are no longer responsible in the sentence.


Colin was adopted for the first time in 2001 but lasted only a few months with an Illinois family before ending up at the Jacksons [sic], who have tried to help him feel more secure in his surroundings. The Jacksons blame no one for disrupted adoption. They know their own limitations: They passed up the chance to take in a seriously handicapped Serbian girl and opted not to keep a boy who refused to wear clothes. "I couldn't do it," says Mary-Jo. "I felt it was unfair to the others." (para. 11)

This passage utilizes several truncated passives. Colin “ended up” at the Jackson’s, although the agency that caused him to “end up” somewhere is never described. Also, the agency afforded to the Jacksons shifts throughout the passage, attempting to remove agency from them.
Specifically, the Jackson’s “passed up the chance” and “opted not to keep a boy.” The language choices used to discuss the Jackson’s portray a very different picture than if Horsburgh had said “they gave back a child.” Additionally, these language choices assume that Colin is to blame for the problems that existed within his previous family. Colin is also blamed because he “lasted only a few months.” There is little doubt that the language choices were purposeful and that those choices represent the belief that “passing up” and “opting not” are minor decisions that the parents made, rather than the life-altering decisions that were the reality for the children involved. In fact, it sounds as though the Jackson’s returned a sweater that didn’t fit or that they no longer wanted instead of returning a child.

A Focus on the Parents

Olszewski, 1996; “One Man’s,” 1994; Plummer, 2001; Poole, 2002; Postmarace, 1993; Reilly, 2000; Roberts, 1997a; Roberts, 1997b; Schindehette, 2003; “Scoop,” 2000; Seelye, 1997; Singer, 1998; Smith, 1994; Stewart, 1995; Swarns, 1997; Tauber, 2003; Whetstone Sims, 1996; Whitford, 1995; Yi, 2000; Zimmerman, 1998a). Virtually all of the articles discuss adoption from the perspective of the adoptive parent. The stories written by reporters are about the adoptive parents and the quotations that they receive to enhance their articles are typically from the adoptive parent. While this may make logical sense, the interesting outcome is that the discourse focuses on how adoption affects adoptive parents and how those parents think adoption affects the adopted children. In fact, even when the article is disguised as child-centered, the language used reminds us that the account is still being given by the adoptive parent, thus always focusing the discourse on the parent. For example, Knight (2001) describes the difficulties involved with assimilating international adoptees into American culture:

For Evelyne and Bob McNamara, recent weeks have involved a crash course in Christmas. They adopted Grace, a 6-year-old from China, in the spring and realized explaining the significance of Jesus lying in the manger and Santa sliding down the chimney was, well, a bit daunting...

Bob, 51, a telecommunications consultant, said teaching all things American to Grace since her arrival in early June has been tricky. First came her birthday party. Then came Halloween. (para. 1, 10)

Although the focus of the article is on Grace’s ability to adjust to American culture, the passage is framed with the parents’ ability to help Grace adjust to American culture. In fact, the article begins by talking about the parents. It goes on to say that “they realized” it would be hard and they were “teaching” her all about American culture. By the end of
the passage, it is clear that the focus is actually on the parents and how the parents are adjusting to having an adopted child who is adjusting to American culture.

This is especially important because adoption is no longer talked about as a process that creates a family for both children and parent. Rather, the end is always couched in terms of how the process helps or hurts the parent that is now raising an adopted child. It is perhaps this focus on the adoptive parent that allows for adoptive parents to be described as “noble” for their ability to “raise someone else’s child.”

**Nature vs. Nurture**

Thus far, this chapter has explored the clusters that associate themselves with the term adoption. It is clear that the poetic meaning of adoption is infused with other terms and phrases, including the biologization of adoption, the replacement of the word adoption, and a focus on the parents in the discourse. All of these associational clusters lead to an overarching set of clusters in which adoption is in direct opposition to biology, thus creating oppositional clusters. This is interesting because adoption is typically couched in biological terms in order to legitimize it, but still is separated from biology within the same discourse. The oppositional cluster between adoption and biology will be explored further in two ways: by focusing on the power of naming adoption and on the direct contradiction that exists in the discourse regarding adoption and biology.

**Naming or Flagging**

The flagging of members of the adoptive triad is prevalent in adoption discourse. Most common is the naming of a child as an “adopted” child, with the term “adopted” acting as a modifier to the child. However, the issue of naming plays out in two other
ways as well. First, adoptive parents are referred to in ways that are designed to marginalize their parental status. And, second, biological parents are referred to as “natural” or “real” parents, which only further ingains the notion that biology is supreme.

“Adopted child”. Although it might seem logical that phrases like “the adopted daughter” or “the adoptive mother” would come up when doing a search for “adopt*” in newspaper and magazine articles, the use of “adopted” and “adoptive” as a modifier is problematic. The use of such modifiers to describe a child is reminiscent to the way in which modifiers have been used in the past to subjugate women. In one of the first books written about women and the language that surrounds them, Robin Lakoff (1976) explores the language used to describe female professionals. She argues that the term lady in the job terminology gets used selectively. More specifically, she explains that:

[T]he more demeaning the job, the more the person holding it (if female, of course) is likely to be described as a lady. Thus, cleaning lady is at least as common as cleaning woman, saleslady as saleswoman. But one says, normally, woman doctor. To say lady doctor is to be very condescending: it constitutes an insult. For men, there is no such dichotomy. Garbageman or salesman is the only possibility, never *garbage gentleman. And of course, since in the professions the male is unmarked, we never have *man (male) doctor. (p. 23)

This explanation notes two important things. First, there are multiple ways to describe females who hold jobs and these ways are more or less offensive depending on the term (i.e., woman doctor vs. lady doctor). Second, and more importantly, because professions are unmarked for men, the assumption is always that the job is held by a man unless otherwise noted.
There is an important parallel between Lakoff’s description of terms that describe professionals and terms that describe families. Just as the male profession is unmarked, the biological family is unmarked. Therefore, if a woman holds a job, it must be modified with her sex just as if the family is adoptive, it must be modified with its adoptive status. This “adoption modifier” is prevalent throughout adoption discourse (“Adopted, Elisa Johnson,” 1995; “Adopting, Ed Rollins,” 1995; “Adopting,” 1994; Albee & Russo, 2002; Boyd & Bunger, 1999; Byrd, 2001; Chamberlain, 1996; Charles, 1998; Cheakalos, 2002; Corbett, 2002; Cunningham, 1995; “Dad, Meet Mom,” 1999; “Died: Robert Gingrich,” 1996; Ellerton, 1996; Fink, 1994; Goodman, 2000; Gootman, 2002; Gottlieb, 2000; Hewitt, 2001; Jerome & Grisby, 1999; Jerome, 2000; Jerome, 2002; Jones, 2003; King, 2002; Knight, 2001; Lipton, 2002; Louie, 1995; Marech, 2000; McDonnell, 2000; “Mom’s the Word,” 2000; “Multi-Colored Families,” 1999; Oliviero, 2003; Olszewski, 1996; “One Man’s,” 1994; Plummer, 2001; Polgreen & Worth, 2003; Poole, 2002; Reilly, 2000; Schindehette, 2003; “Scoop,” 2000; Seelye, 1997; Shapiro, 1993; Smith, 1994; Smolowe, 2001; Speidel, 1995; Sullivan, 1993; Swarns, 1997; Tauber, 2003; Tauber et al., 2002; Tavernise, 2003; Wardrip, 1999; Whetstone Sims, 1996; Whitford, 1995). Specifically, the use of the adoption modifier is typically used in a way similar to Knight’s (2001) news headline: “San Jose couple gets look at yuletide traditions through eyes of adopted daughter” (para. 1). Rather than saying the couple looks at traditions through the eyes of their daughter, Knight modifies daughter with adopted, which ultimately, in Kenneth Burke’s words, creates a division between adopted daughters and daughters and thus adoptive families and families. Additionally, it is
interesting to note that the daughter is labeled as "adopted," but the couple is not labeled as an "adoptive couple," therefore drawing attention to the adoptee instead of to the family as a whole.

Not only does this modifier present a separation between adoptive families and biological families, but I contend that it helps extend the negative associations of adoption by doing so. Therefore, when one hears "my daughter is eight," positive images of a happy eight-year-old are likely to surface. However, when someone hears "my adopted daughter is eight," images of "deviant families" (outlined in Chapter 1) are likely to exist, ultimately making one have a more negative perception of the adopted daughter than s/he had with the daughter. Therefore, by modifying daughter with adopted, the discourse draws a clear distinction between adopted daughters and biological daughters, thus putting the terms in opposition to one another.

"Natural" or "real" parents. Historically, adoption discourse has labeled biological parents as "natural" or "real" parents, although this trend has been downplayed in recent times. Although it is declining, there are still instances of biological parents being described in such ways (Charles, 2000; Egan, 1993; Fein, 1998; Haynes, 1993; Herbert, 1995; Melvin, 2000; "Nation in Brief," 2001; Olasky, 1993; Zimmerman, 1998b). Egan (1993) shows a specific example: "The boy's natural mother is white, and she gave up parental rights in the adoption proceeding. His natural father, a full-blood Oglala Sioux Indian, has never seen the boy or sought custody" (p. A16). The use of terms like "natural" or "real" only take away from the notion that adoptive families are equal in status to biological families. Instead, such terms cause us to believe that the only
"natural" way to live is to live with biological families and that only biological families are "real" families. In this way, if biological parents are "natural" parents, the term would mean that adoptive parents are "un-natural" parents and if biological parents are "real" parents, it means that adoptive parents are "fake" parents, thus drawing a clear distinction between the two types of families.

Adoption vs. Biology

Although the original cluster discussed at the beginning of this chapter was the biologization of adoption, this cluster involves the flipside. In a broad sense, adoption is in direct opposition to biology, especially in the way in which the two types of families are named, as discussed above. However, beyond the effect of naming, there is also an interesting dichotomy between adoptive and biological families that is discussed in the discourse. Generally, the media frames adoption in opposition to biology and always discusses the biological aspects of the family in relation to the adoptive family (Austin, 1993; Barboza, 2003; Bixler, 2002; Chiang, 1995; Dwyer, 2003; Fagan, 1997; Fein, 1998; Greene, 1999; Herbert, 1995; Herscher, 1999; "Home Offers Hope," 1993; James, 1997; Kim, 2000; Lewin, 1998a; Lewin, 1998b; Lewin, 2001; Mason, 1999; McBride, 1996; Meyers, 1997; O'Brien, 2001; Olasky, 1993; Olszewski, 1996; "Robert B. Gingrich," 1996; Roberts, 1997a; Roughton, 2001; Saunders, 1997; Seelye, 1997; Shapiro, 1993; Singer, 1998; Stewart, 1995; Thomas & Hays, 2000; Torpy, 2002b; Torpy, 2002c; Wardrip, 1999). James (1997) describes a specific example of this dichotomy in the discourse: "I agree that we cannot deny a child's ties to his birth parents, but surely Ms. Marangos must agree that a loving, nurturing environment in which a
child can grow to his full potential is better than one in which the only connection is a
blood one, and abuse and neglect are present” (para. 4). Such a description purports that
a child’s ties to his or her birth parents are important, but if that biological family is
unsafe or unhealthy, adoption is a good alternative. Although this is framed in a positive
light, I argue that the ultimate conclusion is that birth families are still best and only when
there is a danger within those birth families should adoptive families exist. Furthermore,
the description asserts that adoptive families are a good alternative to a happy biological
home as opposed to an equal family form, thus concluding that biological families are
always better.

In a slightly less “positive” light, Wooten (2001) describes another depiction of
adoption as an alternative: “In a real sense, Muenster and his wife Dolly got hooked, too.
It started with a family disagreement. She wanted a third child; he didn’t. They
compromised and agreed to adopt” (para. 10). This account is even more appalling to
me, since its end conclusion is that a compromise between having a third child and not
having a third child means adopting a child. By saying that the couple reached a
compromise about whether or not to have a child and that compromise was to adopt a
child immediately frames adoption as less than biology, when it comes to the way in
which families are created. Such an idea conjures up images of a child who is only partly
a child, or at least only partly a “real” child.

Both of these portrayals create a complete story: adoptive families are different
from biological families and that “different-ness” inherently makes adoptive families
lesser families than biological families. Much of this dichotomy exists because of the
negative associations that are infused in the meaning of adoption, which ultimately allow
the audience to conclude that adoptive families are opposite of biological families. And,
since most of the population lives in a biological family, it is easy to identify with the
biological families and thus perpetuate the negative stigma associated with adoption.

Conclusion

Chapter 3 explored the associational and oppositional clusters that help to portray
adoption in both positive and negative ways. Those clusters include the biologization of
adoption, the replacement of the word adoption, a focus on the parents, and adoption
versus biology. The biologization of adoption helps legitimize adoption, while also
continuing to separate it from biology, thus complicating its poetic meaning. Similarly,
when we don’t use the word adoption, but use other words instead, those words are
sometimes extremely positive terms (such as love) and sometimes very negative terms
(such as it). Additionally, because the discourse focuses on adoptive parents instead of
on the children or on the family as a whole, the adoptees are effectively excluded from
the discourse and are only talked about from the parental point of view, thus reinforcing
the positive portrayal that adoptive parents are “noble,” while also failing to make the
children seem as important. Finally, despite the biologization of adoption, there is still a
direct oppositional cluster that pits adoption versus biology and thus continues to keep
the term adoption from becoming equal to biology.

Ultimately, each of these clusters works together to help create a poetic meaning
of adoption. Although there are clear positive poetic meanings of adoption (e.g., love and
bonding), there are also negative poetic undertones that make it hard to determine any
sort of fixed poetic meaning for adoption. Rather, that meaning appears to be somewhat ambiguous, making it hard for anyone to figure out exactly what we mean when we talk about adoption.
In addition to the associational and oppositional clusters that Chapter 3 uncovered, there is also an associational cluster, which is clearly negative, that appears in adoption discourse. The newspaper and magazine articles oftentimes discuss adoption in economic terms, which inherently turns adoptees into products and the adoption process into an adoption marketplace (Lewin, 1998a; Mansnerus, 1998). In other words, adoptees become products through the discourse in the articles I analyzed. This equation occurs in three specific ways: adoption is discussed in economic terms; adoption is described as a "selection" process; and adoptees can be bought and returned.

The Adoption Economy

George Lakoff (2002), professor at the University of California, Berkeley, explains that morality is often couched in economic terms. Specifically, Lakoff summarizes how economic metaphors describe our morals:

There is a fundamental economic metaphor behind much of morality, the ubiquitous conception of Well-Being As Wealth, which brings quantitative reasoning into the qualitative realm of morality. It is so fundamental a metaphor that it is rarely even noticed as being metaphoric. Linguistically, the metaphor is made manifest by the use of economic words like owe, debt, and pay in the moral domain (original emphasis). Logically, the metaphor shows itself in the use in the moral domain of such quantitative forms of reason as moral arithmetic, which is taken from accounting. (p. 62)

Lakoff uses his analysis of metaphors to explain how liberals and conservatives use different economic terms to help make their cases regarding moral issues. In a similar way, adoption discourse uses economic terms to help explain issues relating to adoption. This is especially interesting because the historical roots of adoption are linked to
economic factors, including the fact that parents wanted to adopt children in order to increase the number of people who could work on the farm and help take care of the family. Additionally, when adoption was first practiced, adoptees were thought of as products that could add to a family’s ability to become more financially secure. Despite this history, we would like to believe that children are not still considered products available for purchase, although the discourse proves otherwise.

When discussing the adoption process, there is a significant focus on the financial costs associated with adoptions. Many articles discuss the fact that adoptions can range from minimal expenses to thousands upon thousands of dollars. For example, Castaneda (1996) describes the varying legal costs for different types of adoptions:

Adoption can be a dream come true -- and a financial nightmare.

Just ask Jonathan Logan and his partner, Kevin Woodward, who spent close to $20,000 to adopt their daughter, Lily, three years ago with the help of a private agency.

"The private route can be very expensive," said Logan, adding that a second adoption is now in the works. "But it's worth every penny..."

Prices for attorney fees and the birth mother's living and medical expenses can range from $6,000 to $20,000. (para. 1-3, 37)

This description is important because although adoption is associated with a "dream," it is also associated with a "financial nightmare." The focus on the cost of adoption dominates the description, as well as the article as a whole, thus making cost the central issue when discussing adoption.

Additionally, Lakoff & Johnson (1980) describe the metaphors that accompany ideas when they are treated like commodities: "It's important how you package your ideas. He won't buy that. That idea just won't sell. There is always a market for good ideas. That's a worthless idea. He's been a source of valuable ideas. I wouldn't give a
plugged nickel for that idea. Your ideas don’t have a chance in the intellectual marketplace” (p. 47-48). These descriptions of ideas as commodities are quite similar to the descriptions of adoptees as commodities in adoption discourse.

Throughout the discourse, adoption is framed in terms of economics, and many reporters use such terms as “supply and demand” (Bixler, 2002; “Black Children,” 1993; Harrison, 1995; Holmes, 1995; Mansnerus, 1998; Smolowe, 2001), “merchandise” (Corbett, 2002; Goodman, 2000; McDonnell, 2000; Olasky, 1993), “acquisitions” (Cheakalos, 2002; Stewart, 1995), and even the “hottest accessory (Fein, 1998), among others when describing adoption (“Black Children,” 1993; Cheakalos, 2002; Goodman, 2000; Harrison, 1995; Holmes, 1995; Mansnerus, 1998; Smolowe, 2001). In a broader sense, the description of an adoption “marketplace” also includes many references to price and cost which only entrenches the notion that adoption is an economic decision.

Mansnerus (1998) uses “supply and demand” as a common theme in her article on “the baby bazaar” with this account: “[t]his is the essence of demand – unhappy infertile couples – competing for a smaller and smaller supply of white American-born infants” (para. 3). The focus on the supply and demand of babies implies that they are products which are bought and sold for our own use. The sentence could easily be re-written to talk about oil using the same supply and demand terminology, which would be a more accurate account of a product for us to use.

By framing the article as a “baby bazaar,” the audience is left to conclude that adoptive parents are looking for the best “deal” they can get for a child. In fact, The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary (1971) defines a bazaar as “an
Oriental marketplace or permanent market, usually consisting of ranges of shops or stalls, where all kinds of merchandise are offered for sale" (p. 179). Clearly, a bazaar is a term used to describe a “marketplace” for “merchandise.” The term bazaar also makes us think of a place where haggling is involved in order to make the customer get the best deal while still allowing the seller to make a profit. Therefore, when adoption is described as a baby bazaar, it transforms the adoption process into a marketplace and babies into merchandise.

Additionally, the focus on the supply of “white American-born infants” reminds us that adoptive parents are able to choose what “kind” of child they want to raise (and clearly implies that parents want to raise white American-born infants). In other words, the baby bazaar is filled with “all kinds of merchandise,” and thus all kinds of babies in which parents are able to choose which “kind of merchandise” they like best. Ultimately, the conclusion in the article is that parents will choose white American-born infants as opposed to other “kinds of merchandise.”

The other way in which adoptees are transformed into products is through metaphors that aren’t explicitly economic, but nevertheless equate adoptees to economic terms. Specifically, adoption is described as a “placement” (“Any Loving Family,” 1995; Hill, 1997; “Home Offers,” 1993; Smolowe, 1994) and as a “claim” (Badie, 2003a; Herdon, 1993; McCarthy, 2000; Roughton, 2001; Seelye, 1997; Shapiro, 1993; Smolowe, 1994). The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary (1971) defines placement as “the action of placing, or fact of being placed; placing, arranging” (p. 2192). When
adoption is equated to a placement, adoptees become an object that can be placed and/or arranged, much like a flower arrangement on a table.

Additionally, Harris (1995a) explains that “[o]ther domestic adoptions are marked by the fear that the birth parents will return to reclaim a child even after a legal adoption has taken place” (para. 9). The ability of a birth parent to “reclaim” a child ultimately implies that an adoption means the parent “claims” a child. The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary (1971) defines claim as “to demand as one’s own or one’s due; to seek or ask for on the ground of right; to assert and demand recognition of (an alleged right, title, possession, attribute, acquirement, or the like)” (p. 423). In everyday language, we use “claim” in similar ways. For example, we “claim” our bags at the airport and we “claim” our income on our tax forms. In other words, if a parent is able to “claim” a child, s/he has become the rightful owner of that child, thus transforming the child into a piece of property.

**Adoption Selection**

Although adoption couched in economic terms is the overriding cluster that exists in adoption discourse, one of the underlying facets that exists is that adoption is described as a “selection” process or a “process of choosing,” thus entrenching the economic parallels to the practice (Barboza, 2003; Bixler, 2002; Castaneda, 1996; Glen, 1994; Haynes, 1993; Horsburgh, 2003; Lewin, 1998a; Melvin, 2000). Mansnerus (1998) describes the following scene: “[i]n the baby bazaar, with children of varying colors, cultures and conditions, something resembling a price schedule has emerged” (para. 18). The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary (1971) defines price as the “value
or worth” of something (p. 2295) and a schedule as a “time-table” (p. 2663). When these two words are connected, a “price schedule” comes to represent a table that shows the varying worth of a particular product. The use of such language means that adoption is a process in which parents go to aisle 17 of their local store and determine based on the price of the product, which brand name or size they should purchase. The phrase also helps us recognize that when a “schedule” exists, the lower quality goods will be available at a cheaper price.

Although it is true that adoptive parents are able to select children to some degree, this description is inaccurate. Instead, adoptive parents are able to decide whether or not they are interested in younger or older children, domestic or international children, and/or children with or without special needs. However, parents certainly do not look at a book of photos and determine which child they want based on how cute the child is or how much that child might be worth. Regardless, the use of a phrase like “price schedule” transforms adoptees into products that can be easily categorized based on their worth.

This selection process is taken a step further when reporters discuss adoptees as children who are on display in order to help parents choose who they should adopt. Harrison (1995) describes a vivid scene where children are on display:

The Kellys [sic] were among 86 families and more than 120 people who attended Permanence on Parade Saturday afternoon at Greenforest Baptist Church in Decatur.

The fashion show, sponsored by the state Department of Human Resources’ Division of Family and Children Services, was designed to match adoptable children, most of whom are African-American, with families. It was the second adoption parade this year. After the first gala on May 21 in Macon, 26 families applied to adopt 45 of the featured children. (para. 5-7)
Not only does this scene depict children as participants in a “parade,” but it also describes a fashion show, implying that adoptees must get dressed up in order to convince prospective parents to take them.

The passage also explains that “after the first gala . . . families applied to adopt 45 of the featured children” (para. 7). The use of the term gala is an interesting choice, since a gala is defined by *The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary* (1971) as “gala dress, festal attire; festivity, gaiety, rejoicing, a festive occasion; a festival characterized by the display of finery and show” (p. 1105). In other words, the gala is a form of public entertainment, therefore transforming adoptees at the gala into entertainment for the guests attending the gala. Parades and fashion shows, as well as camps, books, festivals, television shows, and trial visits are all depicted in similar ways, in which children are put on display for the public to look at and decide whether or not they should adopt them (Bell, 2001; Cardwell, 2000; Carter, 2001; Carter & Cauley, 2001; Chamberlain, 1996; Doniger, 2002b; Donsky, 2000; Harrison, 1995; Haynes, 1993; Jacobs, 2003; Lameiras, 1996; Yi, 2000).

Such accounts are problematic for a number of reasons. First, it’s important to note that a Baptist church was hosting this parade, thus implying that it was a “good cause” because of its religious connection. Second, the portrayal talks about matching adoptable children with families, which assumes that parents and children need to “match” either physically or in some other way not described, which was discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3. Finally, the mere notion of a parade or festival presents the image that potential adoptees must sell themselves to prospective parents by dressing up,
acting in certain ways, and presenting themselves as acceptable children. Such a portrayal is certainly disturbing, since these are children that are simply looking for parents who wish to love them.

**Returns Allowed**

Just as the previous description allowed for us to conceive of the notion that parents go to aisle 17 of their local store to buy a product, adoption discourse also portrays adoption as a process that allows adoptive parents to "return" products if they are not satisfied with their purchase (Bell, 2001; Castaneda, 1996; Doniger, 2002b; Emerson, 2000; Goodman, 2000; Hewitt, 2001; Horsburgh, 2003; Jay, 1996; Louie, 1995; McCarthy, 2000; Smith, 1994; Smolowe, 2001; Tauber et al., 2002; Williams, 1995). Although most of us couldn't imagine having a biological child and then deciding to give him or her to the state after several months or even years, adoption discourse portrays this as a more likely move with adoptive families. Horsburgh (2003) explains this practice:

Colin was adopted for the first time in 2001 but lasted only a few months with an Illinois family before ending up at the Jacksons [sic], who have tried to help him feel more secure in his surroundings. The Jacksons blame no one for disrupted adoption. They know their own limitations: They passed up the chance to take in a seriously handicapped Serbian girl and opted not to keep a boy who refused to wear clothes. "I couldn't do it," says Mary-Jo. "I felt it was unfair to the others." (para. 11).

This passage was used in Chapter 3 to discuss truncated passives and the suppression of agency, but there is also an interesting language choice made within this passage unrelated to the previous discussion. Horsburgh (2003) uses the phrase "disrupted
adoption” to describe a situation in which parents essentially “gave back” their newly adopted child.

Not only does the term sound like a minor inconvenience, it is interesting that such a term exists at all. When we say someone is “disrupting us” or is “being disruptive,” it is almost seen as an annoyance. Therefore, “disrupted adoption” sounds like an annoyance to the adoptive family. Additionally, “disrupted adoption” is very different than terms used to describe a biological family that isn’t working out. We tend to call such families broken families or dysfunctional families. Such terms place the blame on the entire family or on parents. However, the term “disrupted adoption” doesn’t place the blame on anyone within the family. Instead, it blames the adoption process as a whole, and in the passage above, the adopted child. Such a focus helps adoptive parents eliminate their own guilt for essentially rejecting a child.

Although the fact that a name for returning adopted children even exists, Horsburgh’s (2003) portrayal makes it seem as though disrupted adoptions are simply practices that are a reality that for potential adoptive families. Therefore, members of the adoptive triad should understand that a legal adoption does not necessarily mean a “new” family; instead, if that family cannot succeed, the adopted child will be sent back into the foster care system.

In addition to the phrase disrupted adoption being employed by Horsburgh (2003), other examples permeate the discourse. Smolowe (2001) discusses the recent phenomenon among celebrities to adopt children. In the article, Smolowe quotes Elizabeth Vanderwerf, executive director of Abrazo Adoption Associates in San Antonio,
and says, "[s]he recalls a single Jewish actress who, eager to please a birth mother, pretended to be part of a Christian couple, and another actress who scooped up several children, then returned those she was not satisfied with" (para. 15). With phrases such as "returned those she was not satisfied with," there is little doubt that adoptees are turned into products that need not be a permanent fixture of one's family or home.

**Conclusion**

Although the history of adoption can easily be traced back to important economic factors, it seems difficult to argue that equating adoptees to products is a positive or even reasonable form of discourse. Instead, the choice to treat adoption as a commodity in the discourse is unhelpful in trying to make adoption a legitimate family form. Unfortunately, this trend to talk about adoption in economic terms happens in three ways: in a general sense, adoption is discussed in economic terms; adoption is described as a selection process; and adoptees can be bought and returned. Although there are clearly economic factors associated with adoption (like the fact that adoption does cost money), those factors are no more or less important than the economic factors associated with having a biological child. Therefore, I argue that this associational cluster only helps feed the negative poetic meaning of adoption and ends up turning children into commodities.
CHAPTER 5

IS ADOPTION'S MEANING CHANGING?

When I first began my literature review for this topic, I was amazed to find how many studies existed on the psychological problems of adoptees, the separation issues of adoptees, the sub-par test scores of adoptees; the list goes on and on. Although these issues are important, I think we must remember that we all have problems, but that nobody’s problems stem exclusively from one part of what makes them who they are. Further, even if problems do exist, there is no reason that we can’t look for and uncover the positive outcomes associated with one’s different-ness. Only when we begin to look at research through a different lens will we ever truly be able to understand the adoptive family.

In addition to our role as researchers, we also have an obligation as people to help shape the public discourse about adoption. Penelope (1990) reminds us that “[l]anguage is power, in ways more literal than most people think. When we speak, we exercise the power of language to transform reality” (p. 213). If the meaning of adoption is ever going to change, it will change because of us. This thesis shows us that, in our current culture, adoptees are transformed into products, adoptive families are biologized in order to be deemed as normal, and the naming of adoptive families as adoptive implicitly separates them from “regular” families. These language choices matter and such descriptions have gone a long way to influence current public attitudes. In many ways, though, we are at a crossroads with adoption discourse. Because adoption is changing radically, in terms of the process by which adoptive families become families, and
because of the changes occurring with families in general, we have an opportunity to shape the way adoption is discussed, and thus perceived.

I originally chose to do this thesis because, despite never feeling different from any other family, others always told me my family was different. My most prominent memory comes from my friend’s seventh grade birthday party. She and I were fighting about something insignificant when she spurted “at least I wasn’t adopted.” Even at 12 years old, I knew that being adopted was a bad thing, although I had no idea why. The only time I ever felt that way was when people commented on my adoption with the intent to hurt me. Today, I understand that the reason people thought I was “different” was because the public vocabulary often infuses the meaning of adoption with an assumption of “different-ness.”

In the end, adoptive families are still families and should be treated as such. Like all cultural differences, we all need to learn to embrace differences, instead of assuming our own superiority over others. The best way to do this is to choose our words carefully and to recognize when others’ words are creating a poetic meaning that is incorrect and stigmatizing. We can poetically redefine a family where the focus is on the emotional connections between family members instead of on the way in which that family was created.

In Chapter 1, I cited research from Bartholet (1997) arguing that the language surrounding adoption is negative; however, that research did not pursue what that language is or where it appears. Chapters 3 and 4, however, begin to provide examples of the stigma identified by Bartholet. Clearly, particular words and phrases cluster with
adoption in a variety of ways throughout the public discourse on adoption. In fact, adoption has different poetic and semantic meanings, and although past researchers have acknowledged these differences, none have explored what the contour of that stigma is. In order to find out how that stigma became attached to adoption and is presently maintained, this thesis attempted to answer three research questions:

1. How does the contemporary public vocabulary repertoire represent adoption?
2. What are the associational clusters that infuse adoption’s meaning?
3. Is the meaning of adoption fixed or is it undergoing what Burke terms a terministic catharsis?

Chapters 3 and 4 focused on the answers to the first two research questions. The contemporary public vocabulary repertoire includes both associational and oppositional clusters that infuse adoption’s meaning in a variety of ways. Those clusters include the biologization of adoption, the replacement/erasure of the word adoption, a focus on the parents as noble, and the commodification of adoption. Now that the contemporary public vocabulary repertoire for adoption has been described, it is important to determine whether or not the meaning of adoption is fixed or is undergoing a terministic catharsis.

The Possibility of a Terministic Catharsis

Burke (1966) explains a terministic catharsis as a “rebirth” (p. 367). Ultimately, he argues that a terministic catharsis occurs when a term’s meaning changes. Given the unsettled and multiple clusters, there is no doubt that adoption discourse is undergoing a shift during the ten-year period studied. The term “adoption” is employed in the discourse in a variety of ways that are somewhat interconnected. However, the terms that
cluster with adoption range from extremely positive terms (e.g., love and intimacy) to extremely negative terms (e.g., adoptees as products). Additionally, much of adoption discourse semantically defines adoption in positive terms while at the same time using negative poetic associations throughout the language to undercut that positive depiction. Therefore, I argue that the current analysis does not prove that a terministic catharsis has taken place, but does suggest that the current reality in which we live is ripe for a terministic catharsis to take place.

I offer four main insights into the tensions concerning adoption's meaning, which act as pressures both for and against a terministic catharsis for the term adoption. First, the discourse presents a muddled view of adoption because its poetic meaning includes a positive way to create a family, as well as presenting adoption as a negative family form. It is within this distinction that we see the ambiguity about what adoption means. When the newspaper and magazine articles were analyzed, they did not offer an answered to the question: what is the meaning of adoption? Instead, they only answer parts of the question, just as McGee (1999) suggests will happen due to the fragmentation of our society and thus our discourse. Therefore, because there is no set answer to what adoption means, it is possible that the term "adoption" is undergoing a terministic catharsis, or at least has the ability to do so, since there is some debate about what the term actually means. Ultimately, there is little doubt that the meaning of adoption is currently unsettled.

Second, current American culture is focused on genetic ties, which presents obstacles for a successful terministic catharsis. As we continue to understand more and
more about the science of genetics and the way in which our genes affect our behavior, our health, and everyday interactions, the focus on genetics continues to strengthen. This fascination with genetic ties is in direct opposition to the normalization of adoption. In many ways, this focus on genes has resulted in an increase in the number of open adoptions, since open adoptions present the possibility of understanding the importance of genetics while at the same time embracing adoption. This focus also helps explain why there are pressures to talk about adoption in biological terms. Because of the accepted power of genetics, those who seek to validate adoption translate or equate the process to biological family forms.

Third, potential terministic catharsis for adoption exists because of the increase of both transracial and international adoptions. The trend among adoptive parents to adopt children that don't look like them opens up an entirely new avenue for the way in which adoption is both described and understood. Adoptive families are no longer able to "pass" as biological families, and thus force all of us to recognize the differences within their family and the differences between their family and our families. The inability to mask adoption puts it into the public in a new way, which could help us redefine what adoption means. We want to accept and value these families, yet it is clear they are not biological families. So, instead of compacting adoption into biological forms, transracial and international adoptions push us to expand our conception of family to something that extends beyond the biological.

Finally, I argue that adoption discourse only helps to further support the idea that there is an unsettling of what family means. Galvin (2003) believes that more and more
types of families are being legitimated as family forms and recognized as equal with biological families. However, she primarily talks about the laws and practices that are legitimating these families without focusing the societal beliefs about such families. This research proves that, with adoption, the public still has not fully accepted it as a family form worthy of being equated to the biological, nuclear family. Therefore, instead of stretching family to fit multiple forms beyond the nuclear family, the public is trying to push adoption into fitting the nuclear family form.

When we choose to translate adoption into biological terms, we implicitly attempt to bring adoption into the fold of what constitutes a "normal" family. While this may sound like a reasonable solution, by doing so, we effectively exclude the possibility of simply expanding the meaning of the family to encompass adoption. In other words, if we can understand it through biology, it becomes similar. But, if we understand it as something that is different than biology, it becomes a notion that is outside the realm of being considered a family. By refusing to expand our definition of family, we ultimately exclude other family forms from ever becoming part of our perception of the "normal" family. This is obviously problematic, since it still privileges the biological, nuclear family.

These four insights point to the push and pull over adoption's meaning. As done in this thesis, the best way to determine such a terministic catharsis is to chart the ways in which the term adoption changes over a significant period of time. The ten-year period I studied does not provide sufficient scope to track the completion of a shift in meaning; however, it does provide a sufficient scope of time to demonstrate that the meaning is
unsettled and that the complex meanings of adoption were not aberrations, but rather are trace evidence that meaning is shifting. Both positive and negative poetic meanings of adoption are used simultaneously within single texts that also discuss the semantic meaning of adoption, which in turn causes ambiguity within one text. For example, one text may describe adoption as a marketplace, but also discuss the loving relationship created through adoption, as well as discuss the legality of the process of adoption. In other words, the term shifts within one text and across multiple texts, instead of in a linear pattern across texts over a period of time. Nevertheless, the subtle shifts in the usages of adoption suggest that a terministic catharsis is possible.

Because the evidence suggests that a terministic catharsis is possible and because there is ambiguity about the poetic meaning of adoption, as part of the public, we have a great opportunity to affect the direction of the poetic meaning of adoption. Although the biologization of adoption, the replacement of the word adoption, and the focus on adoptive parents in the discourse provide both positive and negative meanings for adoption, there is little doubt that the cluster of adoptees as products is a negative cluster. As such, I argue that the cluster should be abandoned and stripped from our understanding of adoption.

Although we understand a great deal of our interactions and ideas through economic terms, we tend to hold human life to a higher standard. However, adoptees are talked about as products, which only reinforce the negative connotations that separate adoptive families from families. Because the public discourse still uses descriptions that treat adoption as a commodity, but also uses more positive terms associated with
adoption, it is possible for adoption to undergo a catharsis in which the negative cluster breaks off and thus only positive meanings remain. Therefore, I believe we should attempt to break off the commodification cluster in order to help redefine what adoptive families (and families as a whole) actually are and to make conscious language choices that reflect our beliefs.

**Connotations and Clusters**

The analysis of adoption discourse makes it clear that there are both semantic and poetic meanings of adoption and that the poetic meanings are in flux. However, another interesting outcome from this analysis is the ability to uncover the poetic (or connotative) meaning of adoption within specific clusters. Most of us learned the difference between denotive and connotative meaning in our basic oral communication class, but rarely do we discuss how those different meanings play out in a particular discourse. We talk about the end result (a word has a negative connotation), but we rarely talk about the process by which the word developed its negative connotation.

Burke’s (1973) discussion of poetic and semantic meaning is parallel to an Oral Communication textbook’s discussion of connotative and denotive meaning, respectively. Because he argues we should focus on the poetic meaning in order to understand the subtleties that exist in our language, he is ultimately arguing that we need to understand the connotative meaning. The best way to do that, according to Burke, is to find out what words cluster with other words, for that is where poetic (or connotative) meaning is found.
In this case, it is clear that the denotative (or semantic) meaning of adoption is derived from the legal process of an adoption. The connotative meaning is much less fixed. Interestingly, this thesis points out that the connotative meanings of adoption are actually embedded in the clusters themselves. For example, the reason that adoption's poetic (or connotative) meaning exists in terms of its relationship to biology is because the word adoption clusters with biological terms. In other words, I argue that connotations come from the way in which certain words cluster with the primary term being analyzed. It is because of this connection that the connotative meaning of adoption includes positive (love and bonding), negative (adoptees are products), and/or a combination of the two (biologization of adoption) meanings because these are the terms that cluster with adoption within a given text.

The connection between connotations and clusters is especially important when one is attempting to uncover how the connotative meaning became such. This thesis helps prove that when clusters occur, the cluster becomes so powerful that the words that fit within that cluster need not even be present in order to have influence. Burke (1969) says that when we banish a term, we do not banish its function, but rather conceal that function. In other words, when we stop using a word, that word is still in play as part of a cluster implicit in the discourse. Therefore, when the cluster becomes so strong, the clustering terms can be removed, deleted, or edited out, yet still influence the poetic meaning of a term. In the end, then, connotations arise out of truncated clusters (or clusters in which a term has been "banished").
Where Does the Stigma Come From and How Can We Lose It?

In Chapter 1, I established that a stigma surrounds adoption. All members of the adoptive triad can feel stigmatized (March, 1995) and even the general public admits to viewing it differently (Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute, 1997; Pertman, 2000). Condit (1990), in her research on the abortion controversy, determined that the public develops a shared vocabulary about an issue based on the way it is talked about in the public discourse. Although this thesis does not establish a direct link between the public discourse and the stigma surrounding adoption, it is clear that the public discourse provides opportunities for a negative poetic meaning to resonate with the public because the discourse uses negative poetic descriptions to help define adoption. Therefore, based on Condit's research, it is clear that the poetic meaning of adoption in the public vocabulary repertoire affects our attitudes toward adoption.

If the public vocabulary repertoire includes both positive and negative poetic meanings of adoption and if a terministic catharsis is possible, it is important to consider whether or not such a catharsis would be an important advancement for the way in which we talk about adoption. Clearly, my analysis shows that although adoption's semantic meaning is positive insofar as it validates adoption as a recognized family form, many of the underlying language choices make adoption a poetically dirty word that is full of negative associations. Therefore, if adoption's meaning is changing, we must ask ourselves if it is changing for the better. I argue that the current trend in adoption discourse is to infuse the meaning of adoption with mostly negative connotations. Even when trying to elevate adoption (e.g., when translating it into biological terms), the
mechanisms chosen reinforce the primacy of biology. However, we all have the power to influence the connotative meaning of adoption, though, and by doing so, we can change adoption into a positive term.

Penelope (1990) explains that “[w]hat we say is who we are” (p. 202). In other words, the language we use represents our attitudes, beliefs, and values about a particular subject. As researchers, we need to be willing to spend less time studying the differences between adopted and non-adopted children or attempting to find out which “type” of child scores better on a particular scale. Rather, scholars interested in family studies, and more specifically adoption studies, could easily create research questions that allow them to study the similarities between adoptees and nonadoptees, as well as the positive aspects of adoption. Or, scholars could explore what makes healthy kids and/or healthy families, regardless of biology. Am I asking that no one ever research the differences or the negative aspects? Of course not. But I do think, as researchers, we tend to want to find “significant differences” as a way to justify our research. Unfortunately, this trend to focus on the differences often perpetuates the use of a particular vocabulary to talk about adoption in the public, thus exacerbating the problem of adoption being infused with negative connotations.

Limitations and Future Research

Despite the insights into the terministic catharsis of adoption and the connection between connotations and clusters, there are also several important notes to make about this thesis. First, my analysis was focused on the language surrounding the adoption of children into families. My search terms included “adopt*” and “family,” which was
designed to limit my results to those articles discussing the process of parents adopting children. However, despite this limit on my search terms, my results still included an exorbitant amount of articles that had nothing to do with adoption in the context in which I was interested. Instead, there were many articles dedicated to the adoption of pets, the adoption of a family during the holiday season, the adoption of a highway, and the adoption of a policy. For obvious reasons, I was not interested in analyzing these articles since they had nothing to do with my thesis. In a strange way, though, they have a lot to do with my thesis.

The fact that the term adoption is deployed in reference to each of these things interferes and dilutes the meaning of adoption in relation to the family. In fact, when we talk about adoption in terms of adopting a pet, we ultimately equate adopted children with adopted pets. Therefore, when we allow ourselves to use adoption in different contexts, we ultimately make it more difficult to determine the true poetic meaning of the term. This cluster of adoption as a way to talk about short-term solutions to problems (adopt a highway to help clean it up; adopt a family to help them through the holiday season, etc.) needs to be explored in future research to see how the use of the term in other contexts muddles our understanding of the adoption of children into families.

Second, inherent in the use of cluster analysis as my primary method is the most important limitation to my study. Although cluster analysis allowed me to see what terms work in conjunction with a particular term of interest, such analysis did not help me describe what was not said. The lack of text can sometimes be just as important as the text itself and may have significant implications for the public vocabulary repertoire
regarding adoption. Future research might examine the use of silence in the discourse as a way to help define the meanings infused with adoption.

Additionally, I only selected three major newspapers and twelve national magazines to conduct my analysis. Although each publication had a specific audience, the discourse is still not representative of the entire discourse concerning adoption. Perhaps most notable is the fact only print articles were analyzed. Future research should examine the way in which adoption is discussed in popular movies, made-for-television movies, television news programs, and/or even commercials. Because the television is a popular avenue in which people learn about issues and how to talk about those issues, an examination of such language choices is imperative.

Conclusion

Although this thesis began as a way for me to personally understand the stigmatization of adoption, it has turned into something so much more important. After establishing that there is indeed a stigma surrounding adoption and tracking newspaper and magazine articles for the terms that cluster with adoption, it is clear that the public vocabulary repertoire concerning adoption currently contains both positive and negative connotations associated with adoption. Without a doubt, the cluster of adoptees as products needs to be eliminated from our discourse. However, the other clusters that emerged in my analysis attempt to both equate adoption to biology while at the same time drawing distinctions between the two types of families. Regardless, the biologization of adoption has important implications for anyone interested in the impact of our language choices.
Rhetorical scholars agree that the language we use structures our reality. With this basic framework, it is imperative that we begin to acknowledge the language we use to describe adoption, and if appropriate, alter that language in order to help expand the definition of a family that includes families that are alternatives to the biological, nuclear, two-parent, heterosexual family. Only then will the stigma surrounding alternative families, and specifically adoptive families, be eliminated.
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127. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, December 17, 1998, Thursday, ALL EDITIONS, 777 words, Wishes fulfilled; Lightening heavy hearts: Foundation delivers all the holiday joy it can to terminally ill children and their families., Rick Badie
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172. The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, January 2, 1997, Thursday., ALL EDITIONS, 1247 words, Student Essays, KATIE LOVE, 11; Locust Grove
173. The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, January 1, 1997, Wednesday., ALL EDITIONS, 504 words, Scholar reminds us that Christmas is a 4,000-year-old tradition, Elliott Brack
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272. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, November 25, 1993, Thursday, 626 words, EDUCATION BRIEFS Gingrich names four to academy review boards
273. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, November 24, 1993, Wednesday, 227 words, National Adoption Week focuses on urgent need Capitol event celebrates families, By Frances Schwartzkopf STAFF WRITER
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>April 26, 1993</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>April 26, 1993, Monday, 607 words, NEWS for KIDS You may be a winner..., Rebecca Perlanimals; maritime; population; safety; fishing; conditions; children; education; regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>April 20, 1993</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>April 20, 1993, Tuesday, 645 words, RACE AND ADOPTION MORE LETTERS TO THE EDITOR Churches could help, T.J. CAMPBELL, Smyrna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>April 20, 1993</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>April 20, 1993, Tuesday, 519 words, VIEWPOINTS, By Tom and Sonia Malonerae; children; families; public; opinion; social; trends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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295. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, April 20, 1993, Tuesday, 493 words, VIEWPOINTS, By Pamela Postmarace; children; families; public; opinion; social; trends

296. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, March 28, 1993, Sunday, 384 words, An agenda to help the failing family

297. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, March 25, 1993, Thursday, 681 words, NEWS BRIEFS Lawrenceville man faces charges in knife assault against girlfriend

298. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, March 23, 1993, Tuesday, 698 words, RACISM COLORS ADOPTION, By Mona Charenrace; families; infants; relations

299. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, March 23, 1993, Tuesday, 690 words, Needed: Black families, By Lucia Herndonblacks; families; infants; children; lifestyles; race

300. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, March 11, 1993, Thursday, 292 words, VOLUNTEERS Adopt-A-Grandparent project turns new friends into family, By Thonnia Lee STAFF WRITERelderly; charities; organizations; profiles; atlanta
Taking family leave could trim vacation, By Gary Klottemployment; benefits; families; infants; children; care; regulations; banking


303. *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, January 20, 1993, Wednesday, 482 words, PARENTING, Marianne Daniels Garber, Ph.D., Stephen W. Garber, Ph.D., and Robyn Freedman Spizmanchildren; development; social; ethics; relations
Two Houses, One Home: Faced with a crisis—four girls who needed love—two best friends didn’t hesitate. (Family) Susan Schindehette.

*People Weekly* Dec 8, 2003 v60 i23 p129

22 and Counting: Michael and Mary-Jo Jackson had seven kids. Then they started adopting. Now, with 15 more at home, they’re living the ultimate supersize life. (Family) Susan Horsburgh.

*People Weekly* Sept 22, 2003 v60 i12 p166

And Baby Makes Two: Swearing her wild days (and Billy Bob) are behind her, Angelina Jolie says she was saved from chaos by the love of a good man: her adopted son Maddox, now almost 2. (Screen) Michelle Tauber.

*People Weekly* August 4, 2003 v60 i5 p84

Separated At Birth: Growing up, they had a weird feeling something was missing. Turned out that something was their long-lost twin. (Family) J.D. Heyman.

*People Weekly* May 5, 2003 v59 i17 p126+

Home Safe: New laws allow women to leave newborns with authorities—no questions asked—possibly saving their lives. But is legal abandonment a good thing? (Family) Thomas Fields-Meyer.

*People Weekly* March 17, 2003 v59 i10 p94+

What has become of the ordinary kids who were suddenly the summer’s hottest entertainment act; the family that adopted frozen embryos; the little dog who was rescued after more than three weeks at sea? Here, a second look at some of this year’s most compelling stories. (2002 Sequels)

*People Weekly* Dec 30, 2002 v58 i27 p114+

Comic’s Relief: After beating the bottle, Paula Poundstone tries to get back to a normal life with her three adopted children. (Update) Michael A. Lipton.

*People Weekly* Dec 23, 2002 v58 i26 p77+

Happier by the Dozen: Diane and Steve Sprigg gave their seven kids a gift of love: five Russian brothers. (Family)(Brief Article) Christina Cheakalos.

*People Weekly* Nov 4, 2002 v58 i19 p95+

Home Free: The playwright tells how fleeing his family was the best thing he ever did. (TIME Bonus Section/Generations/Turning Points)(Brief Article) Edward Albee, Francine Russo.

*Time* Sept 30, 2002 v160 i14 pA7
Oh By The Way... Rosie O’Donnell never hid her love life from friends and family. Now she’s going public to help change a law barring gays from adopting. (Cover)(Cover Story) Michelle Tauber, Mark Dagostino, Fannie Weinstein, Rachel Felder, Mary Green, Lori Rezza, Michael Cohen, Pamela Warrick.  
*People Weekly* March 18, 2002 v57 i10 p80+

Last Chance Family: Couples plagued with infertility find a new path to parenthood: adopting frozen embryos. Richard Jerome.  
*People Weekly* Jan 21, 2002 v57 i12 p44+

In Brief. (rating of American cities which offer the most recreational activities for children) (Personal Time/Your Family)(News Briefs)(Brief Article) Lisa McLaughlin.  
*Time* Sept 3, 2001 v158 i9 p92

In Brief. (older adults exercise more than teenagers, other news) (Personal Time/Your Family) (Brief Article) Harriet Barovick.  
*Time* August 20, 2001 v158 i7 p74

One Big Family: Adoptive dad Adam Pertman calls for less secrecy and more contact with birth mothers. (Crusaders)(Review) (book review) Joanne Fowler.  
*People Weekly* June 18, 2001 v55 i12 p79+

Driven by Faith: Born blind in South Korea and adopted by a U.S. family, Zachary Battles heads to Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar. (Achievers)(Brief Article)  
*People Weekly* March 26, 2001 v55 i12 p81+

Where the Heart Is: After 21 years, a stolen child comes home, loyal to the couple who raised him. (Crime)  
*People Weekly* March 26, 2001 v55 i12 p119+

The Baby Chase: With thousands of ordinary people waiting to adopt, do stars have an edge? Slightly, but not as much as you might think. (Cover/Special Report)(Cover Story)  
*People Weekly* March 5, 2001 v55 i9 p60+

Mother’s Day: Ally McBeal’s Calista Flockhart delivers surprising news: She has adopted a son. (Up Front)(Brief Article)  
*People Weekly* Jan 29, 2001 v55 i4 p58+

Where Do They Belong? Twin girls become the focus of an international tussle after their birth mother places them first with one family and then another—at twice the price. (Society)  
*Time* Jan 29, 2001 v157 i4 p54+

Reunion In Oregon: Records unsealed by a controversial law help Gina Stonum locate her birth mother. (Family)(Brief Article)  
*People Weekly* Sept 4, 2000 v54 i10 p103+
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Seoul Searching: Eleven years ago, my wife, our two sons and I adopted a baby girl from Korea. As she grew up, she began asking questions. When she said, "I want to meet someone I'm related to," we went looking. Here's what we found. (Personal History) Rick Reilly.
*Time* August 28, 2000 v156 i9 p42+

Online Reunion: Jody Swarbrick's Web site helps connect her sons with the birth mother they hadn't seen in years. (Family)(Brief Article)
*People Weekly* August 21, 2000 v54 i8 p100

Scoop. (Sharon Stone)(adopted baby boy)
*People Weekly* July 3, 2000 v54 i11 p17+

Sam's Journey: Adopted by an Iowa family, a 4-year-old orphan finds love and a sense of belonging in America's heartland. (25 Years Later) Richard Jerome.
*People Weekly* May 1, 2000 v53 i17 p84+

Both Sides Now: After years of pain, Joni Mitchell finds joy with the daughter she gave up for adoption. (Family)
*People Weekly* March 20, 2000 v53 i11 p81+

Mom's the Word: Rosie O'Donnell welcomed the new century by adopting a new son—her third child. (Up Front)(Brief Article)
*People Weekly* Jan 24, 2000 v53 i3 p58

Raising Arizona: Empty-nesters Van and Shirley Hughes found an ideal way to save 10 Phoenix siblings from neglect: adopting them all. (Up Front)(adoption of a family of 10 children)
*People Weekly* Dec 20, 1999 v52 i24 p56+

*People Weekly* Sept 20, 1999 v52 i11 p57+

Your Family. (new laws make it easier for adoptees to find birth parents)(includes other news briefs)(Personal Time)(Brief Article) Daniel S. Levy.
*Time* August 2, 1999 v154 i5 p100

Dad, Meet Mom! Newlyweds Raymond Cloutier and Gilberte Bonenfant found love unexpectedly—introduced by their daughter. (Family)
*People Weekly* July 5, 1999 v51 i25 p176+

Multi-Colored Families: Racially mixed households face their own challenges. Here's how they are trying to meet them. (TIME Select/Family)
*Time* May 3, 1999 v153 i17 p40A+(1)

Party Of Five: Three sisters and their two brothers reunite, picking up the pieces more than 30 years after they were placed in separate adoptive homes. (Ebner family siblings)(Brief Article) Richard Jerome, Loma Grisby.
People Weekly April 26, 1999 v51 i15 p118+(1)

Lisa Steinberg's Birth Mother Looks Back In Anguish. (Coping/Exclusive)(adoptee killed by adopted family)(Brief Article)
People Weekly March 15, 1999 p269+(1)

Fresh Start. (American family finds that five children adopted from Poland have emotional problems) Giovanna Breu, Dan Jewel.
People Weekly August 10, 1998 v50 n4 p50(1)

Heart of the matter. (sports broadcaster; Tim Green's quest to find his lost biological mother) (Brief Article) Nick Charles.
People Weekly Jan 12, 1998 v49 n1 p93(2)

Joni, no longer blue. (Joni Mitchell reunited with daughter she put up for adoption in 1964) (Interview) Andrew Purvis.
Time April 21, 1997 v149 n16 p101(1)

My other mom's an icon. (singer Joni Mitchell is re-united with 32-year-old daughter whom she put up for adoption in 1965)(People)(Brief Article) Belinda Luscombe.
Time April 14, 1997 v149 n15 p101(1)

A search for family ties. (Gerry Cummins is reunited with the daughter she gave up after becoming pregnant after a rape in 1962; Sequels '96)(Brief Article)
People Weekly Dec 30, 1996 v46 n27 p148(2)

Look who's walking; Kirstie Alley and her once-'Hardy' hubby call it quits. (Parker Stevenson) Dan Jewel, John Hannah, Vicki Sheff-Cahan, Anthony Duignan-Cabrera.
People Weekly Dec 16, 1996 v46 n25 p52(2)

Died: Robert Gingrich. (House Speaker Newt Gingrich's adoptive father)(Milestones)(Brief Article)(Obituary)
Time Dec 2, 1996 v148 n25 p1(1)
Celebrity baby boom: births and adoptions bring new joy to the homes of famous parents.
Muriel L. Whetstone Sims.
*Ebony* Dec 1996 v52 n2 p148(5)

For a native son. (South Koreans by the thousands offer to help Brian Bauman, adopted Korean American in need of bone-marrow transplant) Thomas Fields-Meyer, Vickie Bane, Margaret Nelson, Andrea Pawyna.
*People Weekly* March 4, 1996 v45 n9 p52(3)

Adopting, Ed Rollins and Sherrie Rollins. (Brief Article)
*Time* July 31, 1995 v146 n5 p23(1)

Adopted. (a son, Matthew Jay Povich, adopted by newscaster Connie Chung and talk show host Maury Povich)(Milestones)(Brief Article)
*Time* July 3, 1995 v146 n1 p15(1)

Latka's legacy: when Andy Kaufman died, he left behind a daughter he never knew. (Maria Bellu) Maria Speidel.
*People Weekly* April 3, 1995 v43 n13 p85(2)

Changing her tune. (singer Sheena Easton adopts child)(Brief Article) Kim Cunningham.
*People Weekly* April 3, 1995 v43 n13 p166(1)

True romance; after 22 years, a couple whose love never died find each other - and the daughter they once gave up. (Special Celebrity Romance Issue)
*People Weekly* Feb 13, 1995 v43 n6 p127(3)

Adopted, Elisa Johnson. (Brief Article)
*Time* Feb 6, 1995 v146 n5 p21(1)

Beating mother nature's clock. (older first time mothers) Muriel L. Whetstone.
*Ebony* Dec 1994 v50 n2 p70(4)

More power to women, fewer mouths to feed. (policies adopted by the International Conference on Population and Development) Eugene Linden.
*Time* Sept 26, 1994 v144 n13 p64(2)

Showdown in Cairo: a feminist agenda at next week's population conference stirs protests. Eugene Linden.
*Time* Sept 5, 1994 v144 n10 p52(2)
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Babies for export. (American children adopted by families in other countries) Jill Smolowe. 
*Time* August 22, 1994 v144 n8 p64(2)

Adopting, Roberta and Jan DeBoer. (Brief Article) 
*Time* June 20, 1994 v143 n25 p25(1)

*Ebony* May 1994 v49 n7 p68(3)

Mrs. Mom. (actress Teri Garr adopts child) (The Insider) (Brief Article) (Column) Mitchell Fink. 
*People Weekly* April 18, 1994 v41 n14 p 39(1)

One man's growing family keeps growing. (actor Taurean Blacque has 11 adopted children) 
(American Stories; People Weekly 20 Years) (Brief Article) 
*People Weekly* March 7, 1994 v41 n9 p182(1)

Crowning glory: foster kid Charlotte Lopez wins Miss Teen USA - and a family she can at last call her own. Cynthia Sanz. 
*People Weekly* August 30, 1993 v40 n9 p110(2)

The adoption option. (more African-American families adopting) Karima A. Haynes. 
*Ebony* August 1993 v48 n10 p46(3)

And baby makes five. (use of extended family results in birth of baby) William Plummer. 
*People Weekly* March 15, 1993 v39 n10 p73(2)

A tale of two kittens. (Pres Clinton's cat, Socks, and his sister, Midnight) David Ellis. 
*People Weekly* Feb 22, 1993 v39 n7 p32(2)
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