



Older People's Participation in Political Organizations: the Role of Generativity and Its Impact on Well-Being

Rodrigo Serrat, Feliciano Villar, María-Florencia Giuliani & Juan-José Zacarés

To cite this article: Rodrigo Serrat, Feliciano Villar, María-Florencia Giuliani & Juan-José Zacarés (2016): Older People's Participation in Political Organizations: the Role of Generativity and Its Impact on Well-Being, Educational Gerontology, DOI: [10.1080/03601277.2016.1269541](https://doi.org/10.1080/03601277.2016.1269541)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03601277.2016.1269541>



Accepted author version posted online: 09 Dec 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 30



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Older people's participation in political organizations: The role of generativity and its impact on well-being

Rodrigo Serrat ^a, Feliciano Villar ^b, María-Florencia Giuliani ^c, & Juan-José Zacarés ^d

RUNNING HEAD: Political Participation and Well-being

^a Department of Cognition, Development, and Educational Psychology, University of Barcelona, Passeig de la Vall d'Hebrón 171, 08035 Barcelona, Spain. Phone: +34 933 125 838. Email: rserrat@ub.edu

^b Department of Cognition, Development, and Educational Psychology, University of Barcelona, Passeig de la Vall d'Hebrón 171, 08035 Barcelona, Spain. Phone: +34 933 125 838. Email: fvillar@ub.edu

^c Instituto de investigación en Psicología Básica, Aplicada y Tecnología, Conicet, National University of Mar del Plata, Rawson 1550, 7600 Mar del Plata, Argentina. Phone: +54 2235441502. Email: mariaflorenciagiuliani@gmail.com

^d Department of Developmental and Educational Psychology, University of Valencia, Avda .Blasco Ibáñez 21, 46010 Valencia, Spain. Phone: +34 963 983 489. Email: juan.j.zacares@uv.es

Funding

This work was supported by Spain's Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness, Reference PSI2013-43706-P.

The first author of this manuscript was supported by a research grant from the Agency for Management of University and Research Grants (Catalonia Government), Reference ECO/1639/2013.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rodrigo Serrat, Department of Cognition, Development, and Educational Psychology, University of Barcelona, Passeig de la Vall d'Hebrón 171, 08035 Barcelona, Spain. E-mail: rserrat@ub.edu

Abstract

Aging population has increased a global concern to keep seniors active and healthy. Civic participation, in particular, has been highlighted for its social and community benefits, and its

impact on elders' health and well-being. To date, however, most studies have explored volunteering, with other types of civic activities, such as political participation, largely overlooked. This study analyzes the relationship between older people's active involvement in political organizations, generativity, and hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. We selected two samples of Spanish older people: a sample of elders actively involved in political organizations ($n = 97$) and a comparison group ($n = 85$). Measures of generative concern, hedonic well-being, and eudaimonic well-being were applied. Results showed that politically active elders obtained higher scores on generative concern than did comparison individuals. Furthermore, generative concern predicted higher scores on both eudaimonic and hedonic well-being. However, active involvement in political organizations was not related to higher levels of well-being in the multivariate analyses. Translating generative concerns into effective behaviors, as for instance political activities, may imply sacrifices and efforts, such that higher levels of well-being do not necessarily result from these activities. Thus, results from this study call into question the positive effect of civic participation on elders' well-being, showing that this may not be necessarily the case for those who are actively involved in political organizations. Future research may build on these results to compare the differential effect of different kinds of generative activities on older people's well-being.

Key words: political participation; generativity; hedonic well-being; eudaimonic well-being; aging.

Introduction

Older people's civic engagement could be considered a paradigmatic example of aging well, not only for its social and community benefits (Neill, Morrow-Howell, & Wilson, 2011) but also for its impact on elders' health and well-being (Anderson et al., 2014). The concept of civic participation, however, is a fuzzy one, with no consensus among researchers on its definition (Berger, 2009). In an attempt to provide greater clarity, some scholars have proposed to differentiate two dimensions: social participation and political participation (e.g., Adler & Goggin, 2005; McBride, Sherraden, & Pritzker, 2006). Social participation covers all the activities which connect people to each other, such as volunteering or caregiving. As for political participation, this refers to actions that are mainly aimed at influencing political decision-making.

Although there is a growing number of studies on older people's social participation, particularly volunteering (for a review, see Morrow-Howell, 2010), research into elders' political participation is still at an early stage (Serrat, Villar, & Celdrán, 2015). To date, research has tapped into motivations to engage in politics (e.g., Petriwskyj, Warburton, Everingham, & Cuthill, 2014; Serrat & Villar, 2016), barriers to participation (e.g., Petriwskyj, Warburton, Everingham, & Cuthill, 2012; Serrat, Petriwskyj, Villar, & Warburton, 2015), or socio-economic factors associated with elders' involvement in politics (e.g., Nygard & Jakobsson, 2013). However, other issues, such as the impact of political participation on older people's well-being, have so far received very limited research attention.

Arguably, this relationship may be better understood by exploring those political activities which imply an active and long-term commitment of participants, such as active involvement in political organizations, rather than low-investment and sporadic activities, such as voting or contacting political officials. The aim of this study is to analyze the relationship between active involvement in political organizations and older people's well-being.

The impact of participation on well-being

The positive impact of civic participation on elders' health and well-being is a consistent finding in the literature, with a number of studies reporting benefits not only on participants' well-being and positive affect (e.g., Kahana, Bhatta, Lovegreen, Kahana, & Midlarsky, 2013) but also on their health and risk of mortality (e.g., Okun, Yeung, & Brown, 2013). However, these studies are mainly focused on older people's social participation, particularly volunteering. When it comes specifically to the benefits of political participation, most research has focused on youth political activists. Klar and Kasser (2009), for instance, found that activism predicted higher scores on different measures of well-being. However, the impact of political participation on elders' well-being has been not systematically studied.

To address this gap, it is important to accurately define well-being. Following the Aristotelian distinction between the 'pleasant' life and the 'meaningful' life, some scholars have proposed distinguishing between hedonic and eudaimonic well-being (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 2006; Huta, 2015). Hedonic well-being refers to the experience of high levels of positive affect and pleasant feelings, and has been associated in the literature with the concept of subjective well-being (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). Eudaimonic well-being, conversely, conveys

the idea of achieving long-term goals, realizing one's potential, and feeling that life is purposeful and meaningful (Gallagher, Lopez, & Preacher, 2009).

These two types of well-being show different developmental patterns. Hedonic well-being (defined in terms of subjective well-being or satisfaction with life) tends to be highly stable over time. Thus, despite certain losses that may occur during old age, hedonic well-being levels are similar and even higher during this life-stage than in previous ones (Baird, Lucas, & Donnellan, 2010). Conversely, eudaimonic well-being (defined in terms of personal growth or purpose in life) seems to be more sensitive to differences between age-groups, showing a decline among the elderly (Ryff & Singer, 2008).

The impact of participation on well-being may also differ depending on the type of well-being considered. A few studies conducted on volunteering, for instance, have shown stronger effects on eudaimonic than on hedonic well-being (Son & Wilson, 2012). If other civic activities, such as involvement in political organizations, follow the same pattern, we can expect this kind of participation to have a greater impact on the first type of well-being. However, well-being levels may be alternatively predicted by certain personal characteristics of those who get involved. Generativity in old age may be one of these factors.

Generativity in old age and well-being

According to the Eriksonian theory of psychosocial development (Erikson, 1963, 1982), middle-aged adults must confront the crisis of generativity versus stagnation. For Erikson (1963), generativity refers to the "... concern in establishing and guiding the next generation" (p. 267). While having and raising children may be its prototypical expression, generativity could also be

expressed through activities such as teaching and mentoring younger generations, producing goods and services, or becoming involved with civic, political or religious causes. By means of their generative activity, individuals contribute to the enhancement and maintenance of the contexts in which they participate, enrich social networks, and assure continuity between generations (Villar, 2012).

Although Erikson's theory, and some subsequent developments such as the proposals made by McAdams (e.g., McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992), restricted the expression of generativity to midlife, it has been argued that generativity could also be present in old age. Indeed, Erikson himself proposed the concept of *grand-generativity* (Erikson, Erikson, & Kivnick, 1986) to describe older people's commitment to the promotion and development of younger generations, and to the enhancement and maintenance of their communities (Ehlman & Ligon, 2012). Expressions of generativity in old age that have been studied to date include grandparenting (e.g., Hebblethwaite & Norris, 2011; Thiele & Whelan, 2008; Villar, Celdrán, & Triadó, 2012), business owner succession and work leadership (Zacher, Rosing, Henning, & Frese, 2011; Zacher, Schmitt, & Gielnik, 2012), and volunteering for non-profit organizations (e.g., Narushima, 2005; Urrutia, Cornachione, Moisset de Espanés, Ferragut, & Guzmán, 2009; Warburton & Gooch, 2007). However, there has been very limited research on older people's political participation as an expression of generativity, despite the fact that the characteristics of this activity mean that it may be underpinned by generative reasons (Villar & Serrat, 2014).

It has been argued that applying the generativity framework to old age could lead to a better understanding of what it means to age well (e.g., Kruse & Schmitt, 2012; Schoklitsch & Baumann, 2012; Villar, 2012). In this respect, the concept of generativity relates to other

concepts such as active aging (WHO, 2002), productive aging (Bass, Caro, & Chen, 1993), or successful aging (Rowe & Kahn, 1997). However, generativity in old age also implies an element of personal growth and development (Villar, 2012). By engaging in generative behaviors older people contribute to families and communities, while at the same time experiencing more meaning and purpose in life (Villar, López, & Celdrán, 2013). Higher levels of generative concern, therefore, may lead to higher levels of well-being during old age.

Research on the impact of generativity on well-being has, however, yielded contradictory results, with the multidimensional nature of generativity (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992) being one of the factors that may, at least partially, account for this. Thus, it is possible to distinguish between generative concerns and the generative behaviors that partially derive from them. Whereas generative concern (e.g., Ackerman, Zuroff, & Moskowitz, 2000) has been positively associated with different measures of well-being in middle-aged samples, the simple realization of generative activities may not predict well-being to the same extent (e.g., McAdams, de St. Aubin, & Logan, 1993).

Research focusing specifically on older adults is even more limited, and has also yielded contradictory results. While some authors have found positive relationships between generative concern and satisfaction with life (e.g., Efklides, Kalaitzidou, & Chankin, 2003), others have reported the contrary (e.g., Tomás, Sancho, Gutiérrez, & Galiana, 2013). Cheng (2009) found that both generative concern and generative behavior were positively associated with life satisfaction, although in the latter case the relationship was only modest. For their part, Villar et al. (2013) found that only generative concern predicted higher levels of life satisfaction. These authors argue that generative behaviors may cause more difficulties and problems, rather than

simply being an expression of generative concerns. This could be the reason why generative concern has a more direct effect on well-being than does participation itself, which could be affected by other factors (Warburton, McLaughlin, & Pinsker, 2006).

It should also be noted that most studies have analyzed the relationship between generativity and life satisfaction (e.g. Efklides et al., 2003; Tomás et al., 2013), whereas much less is known about the differential impact of generative concern and behavior on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. This study aims also to fill this gap.

Objectives and hypotheses

The present study has two objectives. The first is to examine the relationship between older people's participation in political organizations, generative concern, and hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. We expect that participants in politics will show higher levels of generative concern and well-being, and particularly of eudaimonic well-being, than will those who are not involved in this activity.

The second objective is to analyze the predictive effect of older people's participation in political organizations (as a generative activity) and generative concern on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. We expect, after controlling for sociodemographic differences, that participation in political organizations will significantly predict higher levels of well-being. This influence, however, could be weaker when generative concern is also considered. Moreover, the predictive value of generative concern would be higher in the case of eudaimonic well-being than for hedonic well-being.

Methods

Participants

Data for this study were obtained from 182 people belonging to two different samples. The first sample consisted of 97 participants who were active members of two kinds of political organizations in Catalonia (Spain): political parties (56 participants) and single-issue organizations (41 participants). Inclusion criteria for this sample were: 1) aged 65 and older; 2) being a member of the board of or a committee within the organization; 3) participation for at least one year prior to data collection and; 4) devoting at least one hour per week to the organization. These criteria were established in order to ensure that participants played an active role in their organizations. The second sample comprised 85 participants who were enrolled in university programs for older people at either the University of Barcelona (55 participants) or the Ramón Llull University (30 participants). Inclusion criteria for this sample were: 1) aged 65 and over and; 2) not being involved in political organizations at the time of data gathering.

The age range for the total sample was 65 to 85 years. Means and percentages for the sociodemographic variables included in the study are shown in Table 1.

Instruments

Data were obtained by means of a questionnaire designed by authors 1 and 2 and which included two sections. The first section covered sociodemographic data: gender, age, marital status (with four options: married or de facto married, single, widowed, separated or divorced), educational level (with four levels: no formal education, primary studies, secondary education, university

education), monthly household income in euro (five options: ≤ 500 , 501-1000, 1001 to 1500, 1501 to 2000 and ≥ 2001), and self-rated health (four options: poor, fair, good, excellent). Participants were then asked about their involvement in political organizations (yes/no). Those who answered positively were also asked about the type of organization in which they participated, the number of years they have spent in the organization, and the number of hours they devoted per week to this activity.

The second section of the questionnaire included the following scales:

Loyola Generativity Scale (LGS): The Spanish version (Villar et al., 2013) of the Loyola Generativity Scale (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992) was used as a measure of generative concern. This scale comprises 20 items that are answered using a four-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = *not at all* to 4 = *a lot*). The Cronbach alpha coefficient for this scale was high (see Table 2).

Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS): We used the Spanish version (Pons, Atienza, Balaguer, & García-Merita, 2000) of the Satisfaction With Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985). This scale consists of five items assessing the person's overall evaluation of his/her life, and can be considered therefore as a measure of hedonic well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2006). Items were presented with a four-point Likert scale (ranging from 0 = *strongly agree* to 3 = *strongly disagree*). The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the scale was high (see Table 2).

Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-being (SPW): We used the 'Purpose in life' and 'Personal growth' subscales of the Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-being (Ryff, 1989), validated in Spanish by Triadó, Villar, Solé, and Celdrán (2007). These subscales are considered good indicators of eudaimonic well-being (Ryff, 1995). Each subscale consists of nine items

presented with a four-point Likert scale (ranging from 0 = *strongly agree* to 3 = *strongly disagree*). The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the two scales combined was high (see Table 2).

Procedure

The first author of this paper contacted different political organizations in Catalonia by email. This initial contact was followed by a face-to-face meeting in which the researcher explained the objectives of the study and the procedure for data collection. Organizations which agreed to participate appointed a person responsible for distributing the questionnaires to those members of the organization who met the inclusion criteria. Participants filled in a written consent form before answering the survey and returning it to the person appointed by the organization. This procedure ensured that all the questionnaires were anonymous. The present study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Psychology of the University of Barcelona.

Data analysis

First, we re-categorized the variables educational level, marital status, and self-rated health due to the low frequency of some of their categories. Educational level was re-categorized into ‘no formal education or primary studies’, ‘secondary education’, and ‘university education’. Marital status was computed as ‘married or de facto married’ and ‘not married’, while self-rated health was re-categorized into ‘poor or fair’, ‘good’, and ‘excellent’.

Second, we carried out a series of *t* and chi-square tests to identify differences between groups in sociodemographic variables (age, gender, marital status, educational level, monthly household income, and self-rated health). In order to estimate effect sizes, we computed,

respectively, r coefficients and values of Cramer's V . To identify the associations between hedonic and eudaimonic well-being and generative concern, we calculated Pearson correlation coefficients, with t tests being used to assess differences between samples on these variables.

Finally, we carried out two hierarchical multiple regression analyses predicting hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. In these multiple regression analyses the dependent variables for hedonic and eudaimonic well-being were regressed on three sets of predictors. In the first step, hedonic and eudaimonic well-being were regressed on sociodemographic variables; the second step added participation in political organizations, and the third step included generative concern. In each step we checked if the predictive value of the model, measured by Nagelkerke's pseudo- R^2 statistic, increased after the inclusion of the new set of variables. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and multicollinearity. For normality, we checked that residuals were distributed about the predicted dependent variables scores. To assess for linearity, we checked that the residuals had a straight-line relationship with the predicted values of the dependent variables. In the case of multicollinearity, we established that none of the independent variables were highly correlated (above $r = .9$). Five cases were identified as outliers and were eliminated from the database due to a Mahalanobis distance larger than the critical value.

Results

First, we performed a series of t tests and chi-square tests in order to test for possible differences in sociodemographic variables between participants in political organizations and comparison individuals. Results are reported in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

We then carried out a series of t tests to examine whether the two samples differed in their scores on hedonic well-being, eudaimonic well-being, and generative concern (see Table 2). Results were not significant for hedonic well-being ($t(174) = 0.69, p = .945$) or eudaimonic well-being ($t(175) = 0.61, p = 0.61$). As for generative concern, political participants and comparison individuals obtained, respectively, mean values of 39.8 ($SD = 6.7$) and 34.4 ($SD = 6.3$). This difference was significant ($t(172) = -5.46, p < .0001$). We then computed Pearson correlation coefficients to examine the associations between hedonic well-being, eudaimonic well-being, and generative concern. Most variables were significantly correlated (see Table 2).

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Finally, to test the combined effects of sociodemographic variables, participation in political organizations, and generative concern on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being, three-step hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted. In these analyses, sociodemographic variables were entered in step 1, participation in political organizations in step 2, and generative concern in step 3.

Results showed that model 1 was not significant in predicting hedonic wellbeing, accounting for only 6.3% of the explained variance ($F(6,161) = 1.79, p > .05$). The variable self-rated health, however, was a significant predictor of this type of well-being. As for eudaimonic well-being, the model was significant, explaining 8.7% of the variance ($F(6,161) = 2.54, p < .05$). Age was the only significant predictor.

Model 2 added the variable ‘participation in political organizations’ to the previous model. This model was not significant in the case of hedonic well-being, adding only an extra

0.7% to the explained variance ($F(7,160) = 1.71, p > .05$). The variable self-rated health remained significant. With respect to eudaimonic well-being, the model was significant ($F(7,160) = 4.46, p < .0001$) and provided a better goodness of fit than was provided by model 1 (R^2 increased from 0.087 to 0.163). Age and participation in political organizations were significant predictors of eudaimonic well-being (see tables 3 and 4).

Finally, model 3 added generative concern to the previous set of variables. This model was significant in predicting hedonic well-being ($F(8,159) = 2.87, p < .05$) and offered the best goodness of fit (R^2 increased from 0.070 to 0.126). Generative concern was a significant predictor of hedonic well-being. As for eudaimonic well-being, the model was significant ($F(8,159) = 14.89, p < .0001$), explaining 42.8% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = 26.5\%$ of variance). Age and generative concern were significant predictors of eudaimonic well-being.

INSERT TABLES 3 AND 4 ABOUT HERE

Discussion

The first objective of this study was to explore the relationship between older people's participation in political organizations (as a particular type of generative activity), generative concern, and hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. Results showed that participants in political organizations obtained significantly higher scores on generative concern than did comparison individuals. In fact, their scores on generative concern were higher than those obtained in other studies with older people (e.g., Cheng, 2009; Villar et al., 2013) and similar to those reported in studies with middle-aged samples (e.g., Ackerman et al., 2000). This finding is consistent with previous studies showing that generative concerns are not limited to middle-age years and play

an important role in activities such as grandparenting (e.g., Hebblethwaite & Norris, 2011; Thiele & Whelan, 2008; Villar et al., 2012), business owner succession and work leadership (Zacher et al., 2011, 2012), or volunteering for non-profit organizations (e.g., Narushima, 2005; Urrutia et al., 2009; Warburton & Gooch, 2007).

Our results show that older people's participation in political organizations is also related to the expression of generative concerns. In this respect, the study contributes to our understanding of older people's motives for engaging in political activity. Although some researchers have addressed this issue (e.g., Petriwskyj et al., 2014; Serrat & Villar, 2016), the relationship between generativity and older people's political participation has not previously been explored (Villar & Serrat, 2014). Moreover, the application of the generativity framework to old age could improve our understanding of both the personal and community benefits of older people's engagement in civic and political activities (Villar, 2012).

Contrary to expectations, scores on both hedonic and eudaimonic well-being were similar for elders involved in political organizations and comparison individuals. These results are in agreement with those obtained in previous studies, which found no relationship between generative behaviors and life satisfaction, whether in middle-aged samples (e.g., McAdams et al., 1993) or among elders (Villar et al., 2013).

However, both types of well-being were positively associated with generative concern, confirming our expectations. Moreover, this relationship was strongest for eudaimonic well-being. These results support previous findings of a positive relationship between generative concern and life satisfaction (e.g., Ackerman et al., 2000; Efklides et al., 2003), and suggest that this relationship may be stronger in the case of eudaimonic well-being. In other words, although

expressing generative concerns is related to both dimensions of well-being, the relationship is weaker if well-being is defined in terms of life satisfaction (hedonic well-being; Diener et al., 1985) and stronger if it is conceived of in terms of realizing one's potential and feeling that life is purposeful and meaningful (eudaimonic well-being; Gallagher et al., 2009).

The second objective of this study was to analyze the predictive effect of older people's participation in political organizations and generative concern on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being, while controlling for the influence of sociodemographic variables. Results showed that only generative concern predicted the two types of well-being. Although participation in political organizations had an influence on eudaimonic well-being, this effect vanished in the multivariate analysis when the influence of generative concern was also considered. This suggests that translating generative concerns into effective behaviors, as for instance political activities, may imply sacrifices and efforts, such that higher levels of well-being do not necessarily result from these activities. Thus, becoming actively involved in community activities could bring more hassles and difficulties, rather than simply being an expression of generative concerns (Warburton et al., 2006). Results from this study call into question therefore the positive effect of civic participation on elders' well-being, showing that this may not be necessarily the case for those who are actively involved in political organizations. Future research may build on these results to compare the differential effect of different kinds of generative activities on older people's well-being.

Finally, results showed a negative association between age and eudaimonic well-being, confirming findings from previous studies (Ryff & Singer, 2008). Although levels of life satisfaction are not affected by age, feeling that life is purposeful and meaningful could be more

difficult with advanced age. Age-related limitations in future time perspective may be a possible explanation for the negative association between age and eudaimonic well-being, although more research is needed to fully understand this relationship.

This study presents a number of limitations, and results need to be interpreted with caution. First, the sample was purposively selected, and findings cannot therefore be generalized. Further studies using larger and more diverse samples of participants (e.g., people involved in other kinds of generative activities) are needed in order to confirm these results. Second, this study is correlational and the direction of causality cannot therefore be established. It may be the case that higher levels of well-being lead to higher scores on generative concern, rather than vice versa. The effects suggested here stem from theory, and their unequivocal empirical confirmation requires more research. Third, the comparison sample was made of older people enrolled in university programs. Although this is not, arguably, a generative activity, it may be the case that levels of well-being were not significantly different between samples due to the fact that both groups were engaged in what are, at the end, active aging activities. Therefore future studies using different comparison samples are needed to confirm our results. Finally, some of the instruments used in this study also present limitations. The ‘Personal growth’ and ‘Purpose in life’ subscales, for instance, may only partially cover the concept of eudaimonic well-being. The use of other instruments, or a combination of them, may shed more light on the relationship between generativity and eudaimonic well-being.

Despite these limitations, our study shows that older people’s participation in political organizations is related to the expression of generative concerns. Moreover, results from the multivariate analyses show that it is generative concern, rather than participation in political

organizations per se, which predicts higher levels of well-being, and especially of eudaimonic well-being. This study therefore advances our knowledge of older people's motives for engaging in political activities and of its differential effects on well-being.

References

- Ackerman, S., Zuroff, D. C., & Moskowitz, D. S. (2000). Generativity in midlife and young adults: Links to agency, communion and subjective well-being. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 50(1), 17–41. doi:10.2190/9F51-LR6T-JHRJ-2QW6
- Adler, R., & Goggin, J. (2005). What do we mean by “civic engagement”? *Journal of Transformative Education*, 3(3), 236–253. doi:10.1177/1541344605276792
- Anderson, N. D., Kroger, E., Dawson, D. R., Binns, M. A., Caspi, E., Damianakis, T., ... Cook, S. L. (2014). The benefits associated with volunteering among seniors: A critical review and recommendations for future research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(6), 1505–1533. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037610
- Baird, B. M., Lucas, R. E., & Donnellan, M. B. (2010). Life satisfaction across the lifespan: Findings from two nationally representative panel studies. *Social Indicators Research*, 99(2), 183–203. doi:10.1007/s11205-010-9584-9.Life
- Bass, S. A., Caro, F. G., & Chen, Y.-P. (1993). *Achieving a productive aging society*. Westport, CT: Auburn House.
- Berger, B. (2009). Political theory, political science and the end of civic engagement. *Perspectives on Politics*, 7(2), 335–350. doi:10.1017/S153759270909080X

- Cheng, S. (2009). Generativity in later life: Perceived respect from younger generations as a determinant of goal disengagement and psychological well-being. *The Journals of Gerontology. Series B, Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 64(1), 45–54. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbn027
- Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (2006). Hedonia, eudaimonia, and well-being: An introduction. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(1), 1–11. doi:10.1007/s10902-006-9018-1
- Diener, R., Emmons, R., Larsen, R., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Efklides, A., Kalaitzidou, M., & Chankin, G. (2003). Subjective quality of life in old age in Greece: The effect of demographic factors, emotional state, and adaptation to aging. *European Psychologist*, 8(3), 178–191. doi:10.1027//1016-9040.8.3.178
- Ehlman, K., & Ligon, M. (2012). The application of a generativity model for older adults. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 74(4), 331–44. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.2190/AG.74.4.d
- Erikson, E. (1963). *Childhood and society*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Erikson, E. (1982). *The life cycle completed*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Erikson, E., Erikson, J., & Kivnick, H. Q. (1986). *Vital involvement in old age*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Gallagher, M., Lopez, S., & Preacher, K. (2009). The hierarchical structure of well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 77(4), 1025–50. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00573.x
- Hebblethwaite, S., & Norris, J. (2011). Expressions of generativity through family leisure: Experiences of grandparents and adult grandchildren. *Family Relations*, 60(1), 121–133. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00637.x

- Huta, V. (2015). The Complementary Roles of Eudaimonia and Hedonia and How They Can Be Pursued in Practice. In J. Stephen (Ed.), *Positive Psychology in Practice: Promoting Human Flourishing in Work, Health, Education, and Everyday Life* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. doi:10.1002/9781118996874.ch10
- Kahana, E., Bhatta, T., Lovegreen, L. D., Kahana, B., & Midlarsky, E. (2013). Altruism, helping, and volunteering: Pathways to well-being in late life. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 25(201), 159–187. doi:10.1177/0898264312469665
- Klar, M., & Kasser, T. (2009). Some benefits of being an activist: Measuring activism and its role in psychological well-being. *Political Psychology*, 30(5), 755–777. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2009.00724.x
- Kruse, A., & Schmitt, E. (2012). Generativity as a route to active ageing. *Current Gerontology and Geriatrics Research*, 2012, 647650. doi:10.1155/2012/647650
- McAdams, D., & 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(6), 1003–1015. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.62.6.1003
- McAdams, D., de St. Aubin, E., & Logan, R. (1993). Generativity among young, midlife, and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, 8(2), 221–230. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.8.2.221
- Mcbride, A. M., Sherraden, M. S., & Pritzker, S. (2006). Civic engagement among low-income and low-wealth families: In their words. *Family Relations*, 55(2), 152–162. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2006.00336.x
- Morrow-Howell, N. (2010). Volunteering in later life: Research frontiers. *The Journals of Gerontology ...*, 65B(4), 461–469. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbq024

- Narushima, M. (2005). "Payback time": Community volunteering among older adults as a transformative mechanism. *Ageing and Society*, 25(4), 567–584. doi:10.1017/S0144686X05003661
- Neill, G., Morrow-Howell, N., & Wilson, S. (2011). Volunteering in later life: From disengagement to civic engagement. In R. A. Settersten & J. L. Angel (Eds.), *Handbook of Sociology of Aging* (pp. 333–350). New York, NY: Springer New York.
- Nygard, M., & Jakobsson, G. (2013). Senior citizens and political participation: Evidence from a Finnish regional study. *Ageing and Society*, 33(01), 159–180. doi:10.1017/S0144686X11001139
- Okun, M. A., Yeung, E. W., & Brown, S. (2013). Volunteering by older adults and risk of mortality: A meta-analysis. *Psychology and Aging*, 28(2), 564–577. doi:10.1037/a0031519
- Petriwskyj, A., Warburton, J., Everingham, J., & Cuthill, M. (2012). Diversity and inclusion in local governance: An Australian study of seniors' participation. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 26(2), 182–191. doi:10.1016/j.jaging.2011.12.003
- Petriwskyj, A., Warburton, J., Everingham, J., & Cuthill, M. (2014). Seniors' motivations for participation in local governance: Evidence from an Australian study. *Local Government Studies*, 40(2), 240–263. doi:10.1080/03003930.2013.790812
- Pons, D., Atienza, F. L., Balaguer, I., & García-Merita, M. L. (2000). Satisfaction With Life Scale: Analysis of factorial invariance for adolescence and elderly persons. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 91, 62–68. doi:10.2466/pms.2000.91
- Rowe, J. W., & Kahn, R. L. (1997). Successful aging. *The Gerontologist*, 37(4), 433–440. doi:10.1093/geront/37.4.433

Ryff, C. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Ryff, C. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4(4), 99–104.

Ryff, C., & Singer, B. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(1), 13–39. doi:10.1007/s10902-006-9019-0

Schoklitsch, A., & Baumann, U. (2012). Generativity and aging: A promising future research topic? *Journal of Aging Studies*, 26(3), 262–272. doi:10.1016/j.jaging.2012.01.002

Serrat, R., Petriwskyj, A., Villar, F., & Warburton, J. (2015). Barriers to the retention of older participants in political organisations: Evidence from Spain. *Ageing & Society*, 1–26. doi:10.1017/S0144686X15001361

Serrat, R., & Villar, F. (2016). Older People's Motivations to Engage in Political Organizations: Evidence from a Catalan Study. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 1–18. doi:10.1007/s11266-016-9710-7

Serrat, R., Villar, F., & Celdrán, M. (2015). Factors associated with Spanish older people's membership in political organizations: The role of active aging activities. *European Journal of Ageing*, 12(3), 239–247. doi:10.1007/s10433-015-0341-4

Son, J., & Wilson, J. (2012). Volunteer work and hedonic, eudemonic, and social well-being. *Sociological Forum*, 27(3), 658–681. doi:10.1111/j.1573-7861.2012.01340.x

- Thiele, D. M., & Whelan, T. a. (2008). The relationship between grandparent satisfaction, meaning, and generativity. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 66(1), 21–48. doi:10.2190/AG.66.1.b
- Tomás, J. M., Sancho, P., Gutiérrez, M., & Galiana, L. (2013). Predicting Life Satisfaction in the Oldest-Old: A Moderator Effects Study. *Social Indicators Research*, 117(2), 601–613. doi:10.1007/s11205-013-0357-0
- Triadó, C., Villar, F., Solé, C., & Celdrán, M. (2007). Construct validity of Ryff's Scale of Psychological Well-being in Spanish older adults. *Psychological Reports*, 100, 1151–1164. doi:10.2466/pr0.100.4.1151-1164
- Urrutia, A., Cornachione, M., Moisset de Espanés, G., Ferragut, L., & Guzmán, E. (2009). The culminating point of generativity in older women: Main aspects of their life narrative. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 10(3).
- Villar, F. (2012). Successful ageing and development: The contribution of generativity in older age. *Ageing and Society*, 32(7), 1087–1105. doi:10.1017/S0144686X11000973
- Villar, F., Celdrán, M., & Triadó, C. (2012). Grandmothers offering regular auxiliary care for their grandchildren: An expression of generativity in later life? *Journal of Women & Aging*, 24(4), 292–312. doi:10.1080/08952841.2012.708576
- Villar, F., López, O., & Celdrán, M. (2013). La generatividad en la vejez y su relación con el bienestar: ¿Quién más contribuye es quien más se beneficia? *Anales de Psicología*, 29(3), 897–906. doi:10.6018/analesps.29.3.145171

Villar, F., & Serrat, R. (2014). La participación cívica de las personas mayores como expresión de la generatividad en la vejez. *Estudos Interdisciplinares Sobre O Envelhecimento*, 29(2), 345–358.

Warburton, J., & Gooch, M. (2007). Stewardship volunteering by older Australians: The generative response. *Local Environment*, 12(1), 43–55. doi:10.1080/13549830601098230

Warburton, J., McLaughlin, D., & Pinsker, D. (2006). Generative acts: Family and community involvement of older Australians. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 63(2), 115–37. doi:10.2190/9TE3-T1G1-333V-3DT8

WHO. (2002). *Active ageing: A policy framework*. Madrid.

Zacher, H., Rosing, K., Henning, T., & Frese, M. (2011). Establishing the next generation at work: Leader generativity as a moderator of the relationships between leader age, leader-member exchange, and leadership success. *Psychology and Aging*, 26(1), 241–252. doi:10.1037/a0021429

Zacher, H., Schmitt, A., & Gielnik, M. M. (2012). Stepping into my shoes: Generativity as a mediator of the relationship between business owners' age and family succession. *Ageing and Society*, 32(04), 673–696. doi:10.1017/S0144686X11000547

Table 1. Percentages, means, standard deviations, and group differences for political participants and comparison individuals.

	Political participants (n = 97)			Comparison individuals (n = 85)							
<i>Variables</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> values (95% CI)	Chi ²	Effect size		
Age (in years)		70.8	6.0		67.5	3.3	-4.50*** (-4.70, -1.85)				
Gender								13.68*	.28***		
								**			
Male	65.9			37.8							
Female	34.1			62.2							

Marital status			3.96	.15
----------------	--	--	------	-----

Single	7.5	16.
		9

Married or de facto married	68.	60.
	8	2

Widowed	12.	10.
	9	8

Separated or Divorced	10.	12.
	8	0

Educational level			17.89*	.32***
			**	

No formal education	4.3	0.0
Primary studies	24.	6.0
	7	

Secondary education	39.	42.		
	8	9		
University education	31.	51.		
	2	2		
Monthly household income			13.30*	.28*
			*	
≤ 500 euros	0.0	1.2		
501-1000 euros	12.	2.4		
	9			
1001 a 1500 euros	29.	17.		
	0	1		
1501 a 2000 euros	25.	29.		
	8	3		
≥ 2001 euros	32.	50.		
	3	0		

Self-rated health 4.75 .16

Poor 2.2 0.0

Fair 22.6 13.1

Good 65.6 76.2

Excellent 9.7 10.7

***p < 0.001; **p < 0.01

Table 2. Pearson correlations and descriptive statistics by sample. Cronbach alpha values are in the diagonal of the correlation matrix.

		Political participants (n = 97)			Comparison individuals (n = 85)		
		1	2	3	1	2	3
1.	Generativity ¹	.77			.81		
2.	Hedonic wellbeing ²	.13	.78		.45**	.74	
3.	Eudaimonic wellbeing ³	.63**	.10	.83	.46**	.29**	.74
	<i>M</i>	39.8	10.3	37.4	34.4	10.3	35.4
	<i>SD</i>	6.7	2.4	7.8	6.3	2.5	6.5

Notes:

**p < 0.01

¹ Loyola Generativity Scale (Spanish version; Villar et al., 2013). Range = 0-60.

² Satisfaction with Life Scale (Spanish version; Pons et al., 2000). Range = 0-15.

³ 'Purpose in life' and 'Personal growth' subscales from the Ryff's Scales of Psychological Wellbeing (Spanish version; Triadó et al., 2007). Range = 0-54.

Table 3. Variables associated with hedonic well-being: Hierarchical multiple regression.

	Model 1 ¹	Model 2 ²	Model 3 ³
Variables	β (95% IC)	β (95% IC)	β (95% IC)
<i>Step 1</i>			
Age	.04 (-.06, .10)	.03 (-.07, .09)	.03 (-.06, .09)
Gender (ref.: male)	.14 (-.16, .1.6)	.16 (-.09, 1.65)	.13 (-.22, 1.48)
Marital status (ref.: married)	-.01 (-.99, .85)	-.02 (-1.02, .83)	.02 (-.80, 1.01)
Educational level	.02 (-.50, .62)	.03 (-.46, .68)	.00 (-.55, .56)
Monthly household income	-.06 (-.59, .30)	-.05 (-.58, .32)	-.10 (-.69, .19)
Self-rated health	.18* (.11, 1.53)	.18* (.12, 1.54)	.15 (-.01, 1.38)

<i>Step 2</i>			
Political participation	-	.09 (-.36, 1.26)	-.05 (-1.16, .64)
(ref.: no)			
<i>Step 3</i>			
Generative concern	-	-	.28** (.04, .15)
<i>ΔR²</i>			
		.007	.056
<i>R² total</i>	.063	.070	.126*
<i>N</i>	177	177	177

Notes:

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

¹ Socio-demographic variables

² Socio-demographic variables + Political participation

³ Socio-demographic variables + Political participation + Generative concern

Table 4. Variables associated with eudaimonic well-being: Hierarchical multiple regression.

	Model 1 ¹	Model 2 ²	Model 3 ³
Variables	β (95% IC)	β (95% IC)	β (95% IC)
<i>Step 1</i>			
Age	-.22* (.54, -.08)	-.28** (-.62, -.16)	-.26*** (-.56, -.18)
Gender (ref.: male)	.01 (-2.46, 2.63)	.06 (-1.62, 3.33)	-.01 (-2.19, 1.93)
Marital status (ref.: married)	-.07 (-3.86, 1.60)	-.09 (-4.02, 1.23)	-.00 (-.25, 2.14)
Educational level	-.02 (-1.88, 1.44)	.03 (-1.29, 1.95)	-.03 (-1.68, 1.02)
Monthly household income	.09 (-.68, 1.95)	.12 (-.43, 2.11)	.01 (-1.01, 1.13)
Self-rated health	.09 (-.84.3, 3.38)	.10 (-.63, 3.42)	.034 (-1.23, 2.16)

<i>Step 2</i>			
Political participation	-	.31*** (2.18, 6.80)	-.01 (-2.32, 2.06)
(ref.: no)			
<i>Step 3</i>			
Generative concern	-	-	.60*** (.47, .76)
<i>ΔR²</i>			
		.076	.265
<i>R² total</i>			
	.087*	.163***	.428***
<i>N</i>			
	177	177	177

Notes:

***p < 0.001; **p < 0.01; *p < 0.05

¹ Socio-demographic variables

² Socio-demographic variables + Political participation

³ Socio-demographic variables + Political participation + Generative concern