



**Proceedings of the 2nd International
Conference**

of the Journal Scuola Democratica

REINVENTING EDUCATION

VOLUME II

**Learning with New Technologies,
Equality and Inclusion**

**ASSOCIAZIONE "PER SCUOLA
DEMOCRATICA"**

A Study about Generativity in Intergenerational Care in Pandemic Time

Maria Vinciguerra

University of Palermo, maria.vinciguerra@unipa.it

ABSTRACT: *The paper aims to present, through an educational approach, a reflection about generativity, defined as the desire to leave a positive legacy and related activities that raise outcomes for future generations (Erikson, 1950; McAdams, de St. Aubin, Logan, 1993). Sustaining the future has been identified as a key factor in the welfare of future generations and the desire to leave a positive legacy (Hauser et al., 2014) helps young adult to cope with the challenges of the transition to adulthood in contemporary life. However, interdisciplinary theoretical insight suggests that generativity as a targeted midlife task may no longer be sufficient for explaining a life course pattern of generative concerns, commitment, and actions (Kim et al., 2017). Some scholars in the symbolic-relational area interpret generativity as an essentially relational construct: the value of the relationship between the generations (Scabini, Rossi, 2012). In agreement with these studies, generativity derives from the relationship with the Other and it expresses itself in this relationship with the Other. We might consider generativity as a product of the relationship between different generations, not only of the individual him/herself. The analysis underlines how the intergenerational dimension is at the origin of family generativity (Dollahite et al., 1998) as it develops and grows thanks to the donative sources within family systems. Family generativity is a holistic concept because it is inherently familiar, intergenerational, relational and communal. It involves care for the rising generation on the part of the previous generations, including the grandparent generation, not simply as individuals but also as the extended family group that makes up the 'older generation'. The discussion points out emerging educational needs not only related to young people, but also to adults; today there is a priority to educate adults to take and rewrite their generative role in an intergenerational exchange that cannot and must not be interrupted, but that has to turn into a current, social, cultural and economic scenario linked to the pandemic.*

KEYWORDS: *Generativity, Young adults, Intergenerational relationships, Family generativity, Adult education*

Introduction

This paper is a study divided into two parts. In the first part, I propose to discuss studies regarding the concept of generativity and family

generativity; in the second part, starting from the time of the pandemic, through an educational approach, I shall be presenting my reflections on the need to rethink education for generativity in order to help young adults to cope with the challenges of their transition to adulthood. Indeed, sustaining the future has been identified as a key factor in the welfare of future generations and the general desire to bequeath a positive legacy (Hauser et al., 2014).

In particular, I shall be analysing the core concepts about generativity, to try to understand the basic notions and the actual history of the concept of generativity. Then I shall talk about the link between generativity and the transition to adulthood as a family transition, in accordance with the Relational-Symbolic Approach on which there have been many studies in Italy (Scabini et al., 2006; Marta et al., 2012). This link I find very important, because I have always studied family dynamics and family transitions. Finally, I shall try to understand whether, and how, it is possible to educate for generativity, to foster generativity in family and social life, and why generativity is so important in caring for future generations in a time of pandemic.

1. The concept of generativity

Originally generativity was introduced in psychology as a midlife development task, for Erikson (1950, 231), «Generativity is primarily the interest in establishing and guiding the next generation or whatever in a given case may become the absorbing object of a parental kind of responsibility». In particular, for Erikson, generativity refers to adulthood and at this stage of life we are what we generate. Where this enrichment fails, there is a regression from generativity to an obsessive need for pseudo-intimacy; this is punctuated by moments of mutual repulsion, often with a pervading sense of individual *stagnation* and interpersonal impoverishment.

Since the 1980s several scholars in different fields (social, developmental, clinical psychology, education, etc.) have studied the concept of generativity.

For Mc Adams and de St. Aubin (1992), generativity is the adult's concern for, and commitment to the next generation; it may be expressed by child-care, teaching, guidance and a multitude of other actions that aim to bequeath a positive legacy of the self for future generations. In this sense, generativity connects different activities and outcomes «that aim to benefit youth and foster the well-being and development of individuals and societal systems that will outlive the self» (McAdams, 2001, 396).

Snarey and Clark (1998) have identified different types of generativity that are interrelated: biological, parental and social generativity. Biological generativity refers to giving birth to a child, its upbringing and the development of basic trust. Its opposite is not to have children, which also weakens the other forms of generativity. Parental generativity

reveals itself in all care activities that foster a child's development. Parental generativity also involves in passing on to a child the family's values and traditions.

According to several scholars (Erikson et al., 1986; Peterson, Stewart, 1996; Snarey, 1993), biological and parental generativity is the primary 'outlet' of generativity. Indeed, assuming roles as parents (both biological and adoptive) and grandparents, significantly and positively affects generativity. Lastly, social generativity is articulated in the taking of responsibility for young people, leading to reinforcement and continuity over generations, through guidance and direction regarding development and well-being, not only of one's own children, but also of other young people who belong to the same generation.

Clark and Arnold (2008) discussed multiple varieties of the concept and raised the possibility that generativity might be an umbrella concept for various behaviors that have contributions to human well-being. «Thus, the concept of generativity has evolved into a much broader one that is not tied closely to middle adulthood» (Kim, Chee and Gerhart, 2017, 2). Kotre (1984) suggested that there are multiple types of generativity that manifest themselves at different times of life, resulting in an expansion of the definition of generativity.

Moreover, for Stewart and Vandewater (1998), the concept of generativity, as it has been described and studied, does not consider generation and gender differences. For example, there may be more subtle differences in generativity between this generation and others or between men and women. Some studies found that forms of generativity realization are higher in women than in men, that men sometimes decline in generativity realization in middle age, and that younger people generally showed more change in generativity realization than older people (Mac-Dermid et al., 1998).

Stewart and Vanderwater (1998) studied a sample of younger people in whom political activism or social protest was a prominent feature of late adolescence and early adulthood. Perhaps those generations with fewer socially-involved young people form their generative desires later or more consistently in private life. For this reason, these scholars suggest that generativity may be separated into different elements and they also speculate that different elements dominate in different periods of life. Indeed, they think that generativity does not originate in mid-life, but before, beginning to be present in the stage of the construction of identity and in the stage of intimacy, before adulthood. In particular, they have hypothesized a model of the course of generativity: early adulthood includes the formulation of generativity goals or desires; mid-life includes the subjective experience of the capacity to be generative, whereas later adulthood includes a sense of satisfaction in generative accomplishment.

«The midlife experience of generativity may be usefully differentiated as including both an increased sense of efficacy and a vision of oneself as having made contributions to a wider community» (Stewart, Vanderwater, 1998, 94). Thus, the authors distinguish between a

generativity desire, subjective experiences of generative capacity and generativity accomplishment. Separating the elements of generativity in this way would suggest that «generativity may have its period of 'ascendance' in middle age in the form of a felt capacity, it is vitally present in the form of desire in early adulthood and of equally crucial importance as an accomplishment in old age» (ivi, 95). Thus, the concept of generativity has evolved into a much broader one, which is not tied closely to middle adulthood.

With regard to early adult formulation, the desire for generativity increases in middle and later years, along with a peak in confidence and capacity for generativity, and the actualization or accomplishment of generativity. Longitudinal studies may also enable us to assess whether generative accomplishment, in turn, facilitates the sense of personal integrity that Erikson recommends in old age.

More recent sociological studies also suggest that generativity as a targeted midlife task may no longer be sufficient for explaining a life course pattern of generative concerns, commitment, and actions (Kim et al., 2017). These scholars, i.e. Kim et al., in their study, conclude by contemplating how the revised concept and model of generativity may be germane to sociological research, with potential implications for policy and practice. «Accordingly, generativity is now treated more or less as a construct with multiple dimensions, and researchers are revealing a variety of generative patterns, which call for a modification of its conceptualization» (ivi, 2). These authors define generativity as: «the human experience of contributing to and promoting lives of others and oneself».

This definition represents improvement over existing ones for several reasons. First, it accounts for all developmental stages, multiple age groups and cohorts, and diverse experiences of generativity. The object of generativity in the revised definition is not simply the future generations. Second, their proposed definition assumes the possibility of continuous development and growth over the life course. According to pragmatism as well as Kotre's (1984) agentic motives, generativity should be characterized by growth rather than an attempt to remedy the fading self (Kim et al., 2017, 7).

2. The transition to adulthood and family generativity in pandemic time

Bellah and colleagues (1991) state that generativity is shaped by, and expressed through, cultural norms, social movements, societal institutions and public policy; their work shows that generativity is strongly shaped within the family context. It is from this context that it can draw vitality for its growth, or find a position for its transformation into stagnation (i.e., the opposite of generativity).

The family relational-intergenerational approach (Cigoli, Scabini, 2006) proposes analysis of the way in which families tackle the transition to

adulthood; this is not only an expression of a generative parent-offspring bond, but an expression of a 'generative family climate' which fosters the transition. In this sense, generativity is not only an individual parental characteristic, but a family generative process which sustains the transition of the young to adulthood. From this theoretical perspective, the definition of generativity is closely connected with the definition of family (Scabini, 1995).

In this sense,

generativity is not only a family process during the transition to adulthood, but also during other family transitions [...]. Generativity is therefore a psychological and social process: society needs adults to assume their own responsibilities towards successive generations as parents, mentors and employers. Through these actions young people increase their sense of identity and personal integrity (Marta et al., 2012, 148-50).

I do agree with these studies and certainly think that generativity is:

a human motivational source which derives from the relationship with the Other and that expresses itself in the relationship with the Other: care for the Other, trust in the relationship and respect for the 'specificity' of the Other are the main characteristics. We can consider generativity as a product of the relationship between different generations [...]. Looking at generativity from a relational point of view also means not conceiving of it as a characteristic exclusive to adults: it is something that is received and given, something that others have passed on to us and that we, in turn, will pass on, after giving it our own imprint. Generativity reaches its peak in maturity, but it is already a crucial individual variable in the phase of emerging adulthood. [...] Given the centrality of the concept of generativity in the life of people, surprisingly little research has investigated generativity in a family with young-adults. [...] We argue that generativity is the purpose and the intrinsic aspect of the family organization, which includes different persons, various relationships and one group (ivi, 150-1).

In particular, Marta, Lanz and Tagliabue (2012) speak about a model of family generative climate. For them, there are three levels of generativity: individual, family and relational. The individual level constitutes generative concern for the other; the family level implies an inter-generational exchange of what is important (i.e. values) and satisfaction with one's own family (cognitive-affective variable); the relational level represents care of the bond between parents and offspring, and implies the parents' fostering of autonomy in the younger generation. The three levels together provide the family generative atmosphere that enables the offspring to make the transition to adulthood.

Generativity, in terms of a family climate, is also seen as a process, in which the three generativity components (i.e., creating, caring, letting go) are considered as three steps of the family process.

Furthermore, the family system is characterized by greater satisfaction when, not only both parents, but also the child has developed a generative requirement/need; this means that the system produces a generative climate when the family members show respect for the stages of individual development of generative demands.

In much international research on generativity (Pratt et al., 2008), the younger generation seems to constitute an almost passive receiver, while the evidence of this research shows that young people seem to be co-generators, with their parents, of the generative family climate.

Dollahite, Slife and Hawkins (1998, 456) had already talked about a concept of family generativity, this being a holistic concept because it is inherently familiar, intergenerational, relational and communal. Family generativity involves care for the rising generation on the part of the previous generations, including the 'parent' generation (parents, aunts, uncles, and so on) and the 'grandparent' generation, not simply as individuals but also as couples, sibling groups, and the extended family group that makes up the 'older generation'.

In this concept of family generativity, 'temporality' is very important, because family generativity does not assume stable traits of either individuals or family systems, but stresses that lives and stories of people can and do change – gradually or dramatically.

Therefore, family generativity depends on, and contributes to, connections, care and commitment among family members and also between family adults and the wider community. Family generativity, of course, also includes the motives and actions of members of the family acting as individuals, but it underlines collective and coordinated action (i.e. co-construction).

However, because family generativity, by definition, resides in the relationships between generations, rather than only within individuals, it is conceptually distinct from most other conceptualizations of generativity, which focus on individual motivations deriving from internal drive, needs or the development imperative. The activity of family generativity that is consistent with the core concept of holism is represented by sustaining generative connections. Generativity connections are relationships that families have with people and communities that contribute to the care and well-being of the next generation.

Lives and relationships are characterized by time and context. Family generativity is contextual because it is focused on meeting the needs of those of the next generation, who live in a world that is changing through contexts and time. Family generativity also comprises a set of generative connections, convictions, commitments, choices and capabilities that must be continually and contextually nurtured. The activity of family generativity that is consistent with the core concept of temporality comprises initiating generative changes.

By generative changes, we mean changes in attitudes, desires, beliefs, concerns, commitments, actions, thinking, habits, patterns, structures,

and narratives with regard to the members of the older generation, individually and collectively, in helping the younger generation to deal with their lives in a changing world.

In modern contemporary society, transitions are characterized more and more often as being individual, completely indefinite, reversible, minimally ritualized and with abundant possibility of choice. This is what strongly characterizes the transition to adulthood today in Italy (and not only). This temporal extension is producing a protraction of adolescence, and is leading to a new phase in the life-cycle called young adulthood (Sherrod et al., 1993) or emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2007).

The transition to adulthood also takes place within the family of origin, or is subject to the family of origin for positive results. In other words, the transition to adulthood is a 'joint enterprise' between parents and young adults (Youniss, 1983; Scabini, 1995).

Especially in the Italian context, young adults do not leave the parental home until late; the transition to adulthood takes place within the family context, not outside (Caprara et al., 2003; Scabini et al., 2006). Family relationships are formed during the young adult's developmental phase; in this way the family confronts its own developmental phase. Certain authors call this the young adults' ongoing family (Scabini, Cigoli, 1997). The relational family processes, with which young adults and their parents have to cope in this transition, have been studied as a generativity process (Peterson, 2006; Pratt et al., 2008).

The time of the pandemic has caused dramatic changes for social and family systems and young people seem to have paid the highest price in terms of growth opportunities. However the pandemic has shown us that the ability to be resilient is based on social and family generativity (i.e. many at the forefront of the fight against the virus have put their lives at risk every day to save patients or to allow the minimum necessary functioning of our economic and social systems; the shock of the pandemic has made us 'space poor': shut up in our homes, but much richer in time spent on family relationships) (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 2020).

The idea proposed in this paper is that it is necessary to begin from an education geared towards generativity for adults, so that they might be able to accompany young people in the transition to adulthood, whilst handing down a new legacy (Bellingreri, 2019).

My research experiences about parent training (D'Addelfio, Vinciguerra, 2021a; D'Addelfio, Vinciguerra, 2021b; Vinciguerra, 2019; Vinciguerra, 2015) talk of a need to rediscover ethical aspects as well as affective ones in the education of young people. In particular, I am referring to the transmission of meanings and values from one generation to the next, to a concrete commitment towards an educational legacy that can translate into the ability of young people to learn to inhabit the world (Bellingreri, 2015), to attribute meaning to their own history and life within the current social, cultural and economic scenario linked to the pandemic.

Following the line of an educational approach to studying generativity, means handing down a legacy to our heirs with an appeal that they to keep renewing this legacy. Being generative is not to be understood as biologically generating, but being able to create, care and let go, not only in the sense of leaving one's family home of origin but, above all, in the sense of leaving the young-adult the necessary space to rework what is handed down to him/her (ibidem).

3. Conclusion: Why and how to educate for generativity?

To conclude, it is necessary to go into depth as to why and how to educate for generativity. One answer could be that since

the moral dimension of family generativity suggests that, in spite of the transcendent connection most adults feel to the next generation, the degree of adult-oriented, hedonistic expressive individualism present in Western cultural norms and practices results in the need for reminders of the adults' generative responsibility (Dollahite et al., 1998, 472-473).

Moreover, the literature to which we have referred, shows us clearly that generativity as a family dimension cannot be a neglected dimension in supporting parenting and adult education in general. A lot of educational training tends to propose and foster generativity as a source of family and social well-being, as for example, educational counseling, parent training or so-called parental schools (Margiotta, Zambianchi, 2013; Pati, 2014; Milani, 2018).

These kinds of educational approaches today have the aim of supporting parenting, and of course they cannot disregard the concept of generativity, because the studies we have mentioned, have shown us how a functional family system is based on intergenerational transmission and exchange between family and social systems.

In these approaches, the concepts of empowerment and enrichment are also very important (Simeone, 2021; lafrate, Rosnati, 2007); They refer to the possibility of fostering and reinforcing the resources already present in the family system, so that each of its members can find strategies to face the challenges of developmental tasks.

The educator and members of families work together to facilitate and foster empowerment, to develop generative capabilities, both the manifest and hidden strengths they already possess and new strengths that may develop during the course of training. In addition, parents' schools have a strong focus on group work. Groups of families with similar characteristics (such as the age of children), should come together to discuss the educational problems that they encounter with their children and try to exchange ideas regarding the most appropriate educational styles for a fruitful exchange between generations. In this case, the educator has the function of facilitator; he must facilitate and

guide these groups of discussion and training, without pre-prepared briefing, and with the aim of giving space to the resources that come from the families themselves.

Finally, this comparison between families also activates the creation of informal family relationships that can create a network in the community, also once the training is over.

These choices are usually not easy, and it is also possible for caring adults to allow the significant and changing needs of the young to receive less attention than they deserve and that family members would like to provide. However, we believe that, given awareness and efforts through adult education, these failings can also be significantly overcome.

Although this approach does not deny the reality of deficiency and weakness, it does not emphasize the correction of these deficits and weaknesses as the focus of educational training. Rather, it attempts to discover and develop the actual strengths that people and families bring to training.

When people and families come for counseling, they have likely forgotten some things they once knew or neglected to do some things they can do and have done before [...]. Generative counselors believe that people have the capacity to 'generate' constructive relationships as well as to care about 'generational' issues (Dollahite et al., 1998, 467).

The focus is on what is positively happening in these areas and how to develop those capabilities, instead of on what is not happening or how to eliminate deficiencies.

In conclusion, caring for the next generation is ultimately a *choice* that family members make, separately and together. Family generativity is an agentic concept because family members are able to choose whether to be generative in their overall family life orientation, and also with regard to individual daily actions. There is a need to educate towards generativity, but this is not a spontaneous process; it is a process that adult education must continue to foster.

References

- Arnett, J.J. (2007). «Emerging Adulthood: What is it, and what is it Good for?», *Child Development Perspectives. Special Issue: Emerging Adulthood around the World*, 1, 68-73.
- Bellah, R.N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W.M., Swidler, A. Tipton, S.M. (1991). *The good society*, New York, Knopf.
- Bellingreri, A. (2019). *La consegna*, Brescia, Morcelliana.
- Bellingreri, A. (2015). *Imparare ad abitare il mondo. Senso e metodo della relazione educativa*, Milan, Mondadori.

- Caprara, G.V., Scabini, E. Sgritta, G. (2003). «The long transition to adulthood. An Italian view», in F. Pajares, T. Urda (eds) *Intergenerational Perspectives on Adolescence*, Greenwich, Information Age Publishing, pp. 87-102.
- Centro di Ateneo Studi e ricerche sulla famiglia, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano, (2020). *La famiglia sospesa*, Milan, Vita e Pensiero.
- Cigoli, V., Scabini, E. (2006), *Family identity. Ties, symbols, and transitions*, Mahwah, Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Clark, M., Arnold, J. (2008), «The nature, prevalence and correlates of generativity among men in middle career», *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73 (3), 473–84.
- D'Addelfio, G., Vinciguerra, M. (2021a), «Family Relationships, Dialogue, and Philosophy for Children: Words for Contemporary Education», *Multidisciplinary Journal of School Education*, 19, 13-27.
- D'Addelfio, G., Vinciguerra, M. (2021b). *Affettività ed etica nelle relazioni educative familiari. Percorsi di Philosophy for Children and Community*, Milan, Franco Angeli.
- Dollahite D.C., Slife B.D., Hawkins A.J. (1998). «Family Generativity and Generative Counseling: Helping Families Keep Faith with the Next Generation», in D.P. McAdams, E. de St. Aubin, (eds) (1998), *Generativity and adult development. How and why we care for the next generation*, Washington, D.C, American Psychological Association, pp. 449-481.
- Erikson, E.H. (1950), *Childhood and society*. New York, Norton.
- Erikson, E.H., Erikson, J.M. Kivnick, H.Q. (1986). *Vital involvement in old Age*. New York, Norton.
- Hauser, O.P., Rand, D.G., Peysakhovich, A., Nowak M.A. (2014). «Cooperating with the future», *Nature*, 511 (7508), 220–23.
- Iafrate, R. and Rosnati, R. (2007). *Riconoscersi genitori. I percorsi di promozione e arricchimento del legame genitoriale*, Trento, Erickson.
- Kotre, J.N. (1984). *Outliving the self: Generativity and the interpretation of lives*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kim, S., Chee, K.H., Gerhart, O. (2017). «Redefining generativity: Through life course and pragmatist lenses», *Sociology Compass*, 11, 1-12.
- MacDermid, S., Franz, C.E. De Reus, L. (1998). «Adult character: Agency, communion, insight, and the expression of generativity in mid-life adults», in A. Colby, J. James, D. Hart (eds) *Competence and character through life*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. 205–29.
- Margiotta, U., Zambianchi, E. (2013). «Reflexive approach as a measure of parenting support», *Formazione and Insegnamento*, XI, 15-25.
- Marta, E., Lanz, M., Tagliabue, S. (2012). «The Transition to Adulthood and Generativity: a Family Generative Climate», in E. Scabini, G. Rossi (eds) *Family Transitions and Families in Transition*, Milan, Vita e Pensiero, pp. 147-59.
- McAdams, D.P. (2001). «Generativity in midlife», in M. Lachman (ed) *Handbook of midlife development*, New York, Wiley, pp. 395-443.
- McAdams, D.P., de St. Aubin, E. (1992). «A theory of generativity and its assessment through self-report, behavioral acts, and narrative themes in autobiography», *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 1003-15.

- McAdams, D.P., de St. Aubin, E., Logan, R.L. (1993). «Generativity among young, midlife, and older adults», *Psychology and Aging*, 8 (2), 221–30.
- Milani, (2018). *Educazione e famiglie. Ricerche e nuove pratiche per la genitorialità*, Rome, Carocci.
- Pati, L. (eds.) (2014). *Pedagogia della famiglia*, Brescia, La Scuola.
- Peterson, B.E. (2006). «Generativity and successful parenting: An analysis of young adult outcomes», *Journal of Personality*, 74, 3-18.
- Peterson, B.E., Stewart, A.J. (1996). «Antecedents and contexts for generativity motivation at midlife», *Psychology and aging*, 11 (1), 21-33.
- Pratt, M., Norris, J., Hebblethwaite, S., Arnold, M.L. (2008), «Intergenerational transmission of values: Family generativity and adolescents' narratives of parent and grandparent value teaching», *Journal of Personality*, 76, 171-98.
- Scabini, E. (1995). *Psicologia sociale della famiglia*, Turin, Bollati Boringhieri.
- Scabini, E., Cigoli, V. (1997). «Famiglie con giovani adulti: un rallentamento evolutivo o una interruzione nel passaggio intergenerazionale?», in E. Scabini, G. Rossi (eds) *Giovani in famiglia tra autonomia e nuove dipendenze*, Milan, Vita e Pensiero, pp. 19-44.
- Scabini, E., Marta, E., Lanz, M. (2006). *The transition to adulthood and family relations*, London, Psychology Press.
- Scabini, E., Rossi, G. (2012). *Family Transitions and Families in Transition*, Milan, Vita e Pensiero.
- Sherrod, L., Haggerty, R. Featherman D. (1993). «Introduction: late adolescence and the transition to adulthood», *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 3, 217-26.
- Simeone, D. (2021). *Il dono dell'educazione. Un nuovo patto tra le generazioni*, Brescia, Scholé.
- Snarey, J. (1993). *How fathers care for the next generation: A four-decade study*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Snarey, J., Clark, Y. (1998). «A generative drama: Scene from a father-son relationship», in D.P. McAdams, E. de St. Aubin (eds) *Generativity and adult development. How and why we care for the next generation*, Washington, D.C, American Psychological Association, pp. 45-74.
- Stewart, A.J., Vandewater, E.A. (1998). «The course of generativity», in D.P. McAdams, E. de St. Aubin (eds) *Generativity and adult development: How and why we care for the next generation*, Washington, D.C, American Psychological Association, pp. 75–100.
- Vinciguerra, M. (2019). «La generatività familiare. Nuove prospettive di studio in educazione», *Pedagogia e Vita*, 3, 22-35.
- Vinciguerra, M. (2015). *L'adulto generativo. Relazioni educative e scelte di vita familiare*, Brescia, La Scuola.
- Youniss, J. (1983), «Social construction of adolescent by adolescent and parents», in H. Grotevant, C. Cooper (eds) *Adolescent development in the family*, London, Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers, pp. 93-109.