Different in Diversity:
An Intersectional Reading of LGBT Parenting

SALVATORE MONACO

Come citare / How to cite

Monaco, S. (2022). Different in Diversity: An Intersectional Reading of LGBT Parenting. *Culture e Studi del Sociale*, vol. 7(2), 234-252.

Disponibile / Retrieved http://www.cussoc.it/index.php/journal/issue/archive

---

1. Affiliazione Autore / Authors' information

Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Faculty of Education

2. Contatti / Authors' contact

Salvatore Monaco: salvatore.monaco@unibz.it

Informazioni aggiuntive / Additional information

Culture e Studi del Sociale

Different in Diversity:
An Intersectional Reading of LGBT Parenting

Salvatore Monaco*

*Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, IFaculty of Education

E-mail: salvatore.monaco@unibz.it

Abstract

The acronym LGBT puts lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people under the same label. It was created in the 1980s in Anglo-Saxon circles to give recognition and visibility to the needs of all people with a sexual identity different from the dominant heteronormative model. Evidently, the acronym LGBT refers to a group of people with heterogeneous experiences, specificities, and social claims. These differences are even more evident when the focus shifts to LGBT parents. Parenting involving lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender people can take place in dissimilar forms, conditioned by people's sexual identity but also by other socio-demographic factors.

Within the paradigm of *intersectionality theory*, this paper aims to highlight the challenges LGBT parents face in contemporary Italy, emphasizing the effects of the intersection of different variables on parenting beyond traditional heteronormative conceptions of family life.

The paper is based on an analysis of a part of the data collected within the project of national interest (PRIN) "Constructions of parenting on insecure grounds (CoPInG)," aimed at understanding how parents living under uncertainty practice family life and their ways of coping with the challenges associated with parenting.

Funding: The information used for this paper originated from the project "Constructions of Parenting on Insecure Grounds: What Role for Social Work? (CoPInG)." Grant Program: PRIN 2017—Funding from the Italian Ministry of Universities and Research for research projects of national interest (Grant number: 2017ZKSE5N).

Keywords: coping; Italy; LGBT parenting

Introduction

In recent decades the structure of the Italian family has undergone a series of profound changes, making it even more evident that the family is a changing institution, which takes on different forms and configurations depending on the territorial, cultural, and temporal context within which it is embedded (Kertzer & Saller, 1991; Therborn, 2004). Indeed, the social and economic transformations that have affected the peninsula have contributed to a significant reconfiguration of family structure and life. The most recent statistics paint a picture of an Italy in which nuclear families, composed of married partners with children—a sort of social standard toward which people once strived—are increasingly giving way to other family types (such as unipersonal, single-parent, unmarried, reconstituted, and extended), with the average number of members dropping from 3.35 in 1971 to 2.29 in 2019 (ISTAT, 2022).

Different in Diversity:
An Intersectional Reading of LGBT Parenting

In Italy as elsewhere, the year 1968 represents a point of rupture with the past. This year of great turmoil was animated globally, especially by feminist movements and collectives moved by the desire to subvert traditional gender models and claiming new spaces in women's public and private lives (Barbagli & Saraceno, 1997; Passerini, 1996). Subsequent divorce and abortion laws further contributed to unhinging the static and opaque vision of the family in Italy, effectively sanctioning its dissolvable character, in light of the unprecedented self-determining power of women with respect to the possibilities of procreation (Bettarini & D'Andrea, 1996; De Giorgio & Klapisch-Zuber, 1996). In 1975, the reform of Italian family law not only established equality between parents, but also abolished legal discrimination against children born out of wedlock, giving parenthood yet another meaning (Bernini, 2008; Caldwell, 1991). The gradual increase in women's educational level, together with new laws against discrimination in employment, boosted women's presence in the labor market in the 1980s, producing further changes. More specifically, women began to trend toward professional fulfillment, sometimes postponing or forgoing motherhood (Boca & Saraceno, 2005; Morlicchio & Pirone, 2015; Naldini & Saraceno, 2011). Moreover, medical breakthroughs and the spread of reproductive technologies have enabled people previously excluded from procreation—such as infertile individuals, the elderly, and same-sex couples—to gain access to parenthood (Cristofari, 2007; Di Martino, 2020; Inhorn & Birenbaum-Carmeli, 2008; Parisi, 2018; Zanatta, 2008).

Thus, although it is clear that nothing is less natural than family, in every age and in every society there exists what Saraceno (2017) has called the "normative paradox" of the family, which ascribes to family certain crystallized characteristics, on the basis of which a model of good parenting is developed and assumed as an ideal. This situation depends largely on the fact that all cultures take the existence of the family for granted, so much so that it assumes (in each of them) the traits of a "social fact" (à la Durkheim, 1895) so "natural" and obvious that it makes families with characteristics different from the dominant model—assumed for a period of time as the norm—almost socially incomprehensible, if not unacceptable.

More specifically, to this day, the stereotype of the "cereal packet family," which proposes an idealized image of a "happy family" composed of bourgeois partners of different sexes, married with children (Leach, 1968; Oakley, 1982), is still very much rooted in the Italian context. This is a conventional family model that, although far removed from families that inhabit contemporary society, continues to occupy an important space in the collective imagination (Morgan, 2011). Its distinctive traits are considered essential for being deemed a "good family," without considering many other factors, such as the quality of intra-family relationships, the weight of other formal and informal networks, or the role of communities (Ansell, 2016; Ennew, 2002).

In contemporary Italy, the model of the conjugal and intimate family as a prerequisite for good parenting is reinforced by mass media communication, which uses this prototype even in the most current representations (Boero, 2018), but also by the most populist and conservative political propaganda, which continues to defend the so-called "traditional family" (Baiocco et al., 2018; Ben-Porat et al., 2021; Corbisiero & Monaco, 2021; Ioverno et al., 2019; Lazaridis & Campani, 2016).

Conceptualized in this way, the stereotype of good parenting does not consider various family constellations, which, conversely, do not enjoy social consideration or credibility, in spite of a large body of literature that has repeatedly pointed out that parenting is an autonomous and processual function of human beings that cannot and should not be considered the result of a necessary coincidence with other dimensions that a normative (or normalizing) culture assumes (Eve et al., 2014; Fargion, 2021; Steinberg, 2004).

Among the different groups of socially unexpected parents are members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community (Ferrari, 2020; Gilley & Masullo, 2022; Monaco, 2022a; Monaco & Nothdurfter, 2021b). These are sexual and gender minority individuals who are often in a vulnerable position, since they construct their family lives in (apparent) opposition to conventionally recognized processes (Allen, 2007; Fruggeri, 1998; Moore & Stambolis-Ruhstorfer, 2013). As Butler (2004) argues, LGBT parents are the subject of distorted representations, based on an arbitrary overlap between the concept of family and other aspects ideologically associated with the construct of good parenting, such as generativity, conjugality, cohabitation, the parents' heterosexual orientation, and the continuity of their biological sex (Bastianoni, 2009). This is a view that derivers from heteronormativity, an ideological apparatus that assumes heterosexuality as a social norm and a prerequisite for the exclusive legitimization of identities and relationships (Allen & Mendez, 2018; Berkowitz, 2009; Franchi & Selmi, 2020a; Hayman et al., 2013; Kurdek, 2006; Lasio et al., 2019).

As has been highlighted within the international literature (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Few-Demo, 2014; Oswald, 2000), heteronormativity affects all families, but it particularly impacts LGBT parents, since they deal with significant and pervasive levels of prejudice and discrimination.

Drawing on data collected as part of a national research project on parenting, this paper aims to critically highlight some of the main challenges LGBT parents face in contemporary Italy, with a specific focus on stereotypes resulting from the intersection of their sexual identity and their other identity characteristics.

LGBT Parenting: An Intersectional Reading

The acronym LGBT was created in the 1980s in Anglo-Saxon circles to give recognition and visibility to the needs of all people with a sexual identity different from the dominant heteronormative model. This acronym refers to a group of people with heterogeneous backgrounds, specificities, and social claims. The differences are even more striking if the focus shifts to LGBT parents. In fact, parenting involving lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender people can take place in very different forms, with paths, obstacles and resources that can vary greatly according to specific contingencies. Such variations can be found both in the pathways that lead LGBT people to become parents and in the ways in which they care for and raise their children (Gates, 2013; Ross & Dobinson, 2013).

The increasing visibility and variance within the group of families with LGBT parents has highlighted the need to conduct rigorous analyses of families of people belonging to sexual minorities within the family studies field (Allen, 2015; Lewis

& Grzanka, 2016). Against this background, various contributions have emphasized the need to pay attention to how the diverse combinations of different variables are able to produce parenting beyond the generic LGBT acronym, to better understand the multiple consequences of identity intersections on people's lives (Allen, 2015; April et al., 2016; Biblarz & Savci, 2010; Goldberg & Gartrell, 2014; Reczek, 2020). In agreement with Goldberg and Allen (2020), there are still too few studies focusing on LGBT parents that highlight not only the common challenges, but also the specific situations resulting from the intersection between their membership in the LGBT community and other socio-demographic factors, such as gender, socio-economic conditions, ethnicity, or territorial location.

As reported elsewhere (Monaco & Nothdurfter, 2021a), even in Italy, most sociological research on LGBT parenting has focused primarily on parents' individual attributes, such as their sexual orientation or the type of relationship in which they were involved. More specifically, early studies focused on lesbian mothers and gay fathers who became parents during a previous heterosexual relationship (Barbagli & Colombo, 2001; Bonaccorso, 1994; Bottino & Danna, 2005; Danna, 1998). At a later stage, Italian social research focused increasingly on the parenting choices of LGBT singles and same-sex couples with children born using assisted reproduction (Bertone, 2015; Bosisio & Ronfani, 2015; Franchi & Selmi, 2020b; Lelleri, Prati & Pietrantoni, 2008; Trappolin, 2016; Trappolin & Tiano, 2019), looking mainly at advantaged families and contexts.

As argued by many feminist scholars (Crenshaw, 1993; Hancock, 2007; Hurtado, 2018), in the analysis of social phenomena, it is important to adopt an intersectional perspective, which takes due account of intersecting categories in order to avoid partial or even simplistic readings. Under this critical angle, intersectionality theory finds its raison d'être in the possibility of arriving at more comprehensive accounts of the experiences of social groups. More specifically, every combination of attributes gives rise to distinctive experiences that are not reducible to the original individual identities in relation to each other. On the contrary, it is precisely in their interconnectedness that categories structure the social and material lives of social actors (Cole, 2009). In line with these assumptions, the present study offers a snapshot of the experiences of Italian LGBT parents by simultaneously considering other elements besides their sexual identity.

The Present Study

The data used in this paper were collected as part of the larger project of national interest "Constructions of parenting on insecure grounds (CoPInG)." This qualitative study, launched in 2019, aimed at giving a voice and visibility to the demands of Italian parents living in conditions of vulnerability due to one or more of their characteristics. The overall objective of the research was to compare parents' views on childcare and education and their reaction to dominant ideologies with both the discourse on parenting that emerges in family policies and the discourse expressed by social workers. The pool of subjects involved in the study included parents experiencing

major conflict, economic hardship, or situations of forced migration, and people belonging to sexual or gender minorities.

More specifically, the analysis presented in this paper is based on 54 individual interviews collected between 2020 and 2022 with 54 LGBT parents.

In line with the key principles of intersectionality, in order to fully understand the different forms of social inequality that Italian LGBT parents experience, the research used a methodology aimed at accommodating the views of the subjects, dialoguing with people who have experienced firsthand the more or less pronounced forms of social injustice (Corbisiero & Nocenzi, 2022; Tavory & Timmermans, 2014).

Another characteristic of intersectional research is its use of a critical methodology to pursue change and social justice through research work (Collins et al., 2021).

Against this background, intersectional research should be based on the co-construction of knowledge, overcoming the traditional role differences between those conducting the research and the subjects of the research. In addition, the critical approach is geared toward producing social change in order to offer a clear and comprehensible reading of the systems of power and privilege that characterize everyday experiences and processes (Oswald et al., 2009).

In line with these assumptions, the research used a grounded approach, so that it was not conditioned by theoretical speculation. Participants were recruited based on theoretical sampling, examining different contexts and dividing them into socio-cultural and geographic macro areas (Tarozzi, 2008). The working group decided to target LGBT people who had become parents through various means (current or former relationships, coparenting, adoption, foster care, donor insemination, reciprocal IVF, and surrogacy). In light of the distinct characteristics of territories in terms of local policies and the involvement of associations, further attention was also paid to the geographical distribution of families, balancing the participation of individuals residing in the four main Italian macro-areas (South and Islands, Central Italy, Northeast Italy, and Northwest Italy) and between urban centers and peripheral contexts.

Study participants were recruited with the support of the associations, but also through an online recruitment campaign, followed by snowball sampling.

The average age of the LGBT parents involved in the study was 44, with the youngest parent being 28 years old and the oldest parent being 70 years old. At the time of the interview, seven people reported that they were not engaged in any work activity. All other parents were employed.

The interviews lasted an average of one hour and were recorded, transcribed, and anonymized with the consent of each participant. The interviews began with an open-ended question about family history in order to encourage storytelling (Riessman, 2008), followed by questions from the researchers about the parents' relationships with institutions, difficulties encountered in their daily lives, and their networks of formal and informal relationships.

The categories considered for the analysis and their intersections emerged spontaneously from the stories told by the sampled parents.

According to Hancock (2007), intersectional research must focus on main categories that above all produce forms of social injustice. This means that in each specific analysis, it is necessary to select a certain number of categories or to establish anchor points as a strategic choice (Ludvig, 2006; McCall, 2005; Phoenix, 2006; Yuval-Davis, 2011). This operation is necessary both to make the analysis manageable and to gain a better understanding of the categories deemed most important for a specific research question at a particular time.

In this paper, the intersections among sexual identity, gender, socio-economic conditions, and area of residence will be considered. This does not mean that other categories are irrelevant (such as age or disability), but only that these categories did not emerge as central from the parents' narratives.

Gender makes a Difference

As anticipated, the Italian literature on LGBT parenting devotes the largest space to so-called "rainbow families," in which the parents are same-sex couples using assisted reproductive technologies. In an attempt to highlight the experiences that characterize the lives of same-sex parent families, several contributions have offered analyses seemingly based on an assumption of homogeneity among rainbow families that is not always found in empirical reality. In fact, interviews conducted within "CoPInG" have shown that the intertwining of parents' (homo)sexual orientation and their gender produces differential risks of intersectional discrimination. In other words, although Italian male and female couples legally experience the same condition of partial recognition, in their daily lives mothers and fathers encounter different challenges:

> Unfortunately, there is a form of machismo according to which the mother is the parent who must take care of the child. This is the real problem in Italy, particularly in Italy. So, it's clear that seeing two dads changing a diaper or taking care of a child... dressing him, giving him attention, bathing him... it may seem strange. (Interview n. 21, cisgender gay man, Southern Italy)

> I noticed that practitioners are often better predisposed toward women, toward female parenting, because the lack of a mother is still seen as a form of deprivation for the child. (Interview n. 29, cisgender lesbian woman, Central Italy)

> Parenting is a very difficult job, but probably it is more difficult for a couple of fathers, because, unfortunately, society, at least Italian society, thinks that it is almost a mothers' duty to be a parent, so the male, the typical white cisgender patriarch, acts as the master father... (Interview n. 30, transgender bisexual woman, Northwest Italy)

According to some scholars (Ioverno et al., 2019), the idea—still widespread in

Italy—that a female figure is necessary for the raising of a child is based on a cultural assumption that motherhood and fatherhood are different constructs, despite the fact that the scientific literature, through comparative studies, has repeatedly documented that parenting is carried out irrespective of the sexual identity of the subjects (Few-Demo, 2016; Gates, 2015; Kurdek, 2004). Research on this topic (Pistella et al., 2018) has also highlighted that in Italy, negative attitudes toward two-father parenting are more common in individuals with stronger sexist beliefs, since these people tend to have a rigid and stereotypical view of gender roles.

Such a view of social reality forms the basis for what Park (2013) called "monomaternalism," which can be defined as an ideological view that results from the intersection of patriarchy (according to which women are responsible for social and biological reproduction), heteronormativity (which only considers intimate relationships between a man and a woman socially acceptable), capitalism (which deems children the property of their parents), and Eurocentrism (which denies the possibility that multiple parenting models can exist).

In line with other studies on LGBT parenting (Coppola & Masullo, 2022; Downing, 2013; Lev, 2010; Ryan, 2009), research has revealed that transgender parents also challenge gendered practices that view certain parenting behaviors as inherently masculine or feminine, experiencing transphobia, social disapproval, and a lack of informal support from the general community as a result:

> It seems that we are second-class parents only because of our sexual identity. (Interview n. 9, transgender heterosexual man, Northwest Italy)

> As a transgender parent, for sure I was judged a heartlessmother by my neighbors. (Interview n. 20, transgender bisexual man, Northwest Italy)

Through interviews, transgender participants not only expressed stories and reflections on the meaning of living as transgender people in contemporary Italy, but also presented a nuanced narrative that highlights the additional difficulties they experience as parents. Most participants repeatedly stated their belief that, in Italian public opinion, the transition of a parent (particularly from female to male) would inevitably change the nature and the quality of their relationship with their children. This situation is in part reflected in current legislation. In fact, according to the law, a change in gender is considered a limitation to the exercise of parenting, as the transition is deemed detrimental to the psychophysical integrity of minors (Ruspini & Inghilleri, 2008). Therefore, in accordance with the provisions of Article 61 of the Code of Civil Procedure, judges can request a verification of the ability of transgender parents to perform the functions of caring for and protecting their child (De Leo & Malagoli Togliatti, 1990).

The Weight of Socio-Economic Conditions

Another variable that can generate additional differences among LGBT parents is found in the economic sphere. For example, an Italian parent must consider a number of expenses that will be incurred if they proceed with the transition. In addition to the expenses that people usually incur when they decide to undertake a transitional path—such as psychological support, hormone therapy, and (potential) surgeries—parents must also have the financial means to obtain authorization from the court. Indeed, beyond the administrative costs, parents who intend to request authorization from the court to formalize their transition path will also have to consider the possible payment of one or more court-appointed technical consultants (CTUs):

> Until the 1990s, systematically, and in every case, under Law 164, the judge, not being satisfied with the medical report, would ask for a CTU, which could be another psychologist, sometimes a psychiatrist, or often people fished out of the court's list of CTUs. [...] The dramatic thing is that this CTU is being paid by the person asking for the transition... So, I had to pay him. I had to pay 1400€ to a psychiatrist who I had to see three times and who also demanded to see my children. I don't understand why the judge needed to involve another expert. (Interview n. 23, transgender bisexual woman, Southern Italy)

This situation is a burden that can exacerbate the often already precarious economic conditions of transgender people, due in some circumstances to the difficulties—described in some interviews—that they encounter to obtain a job (Kenagy & Hsieh, 2005; Magalhães et al., 2020):

> I couldn't find a job because the answer was, "We don't know how to allocate a woman with men's documents." (Interview n. 30, transgender bisexual woman, Northwest Italy)

> I never told the boy I tutor that I am a transgender person [...]. I'm afraid of losing my job and I need to work.... (Interview n. 20, transgender heterosexual man, Northwest Italy)

Some of the research participants also emphasized their awareness that stereotypes related to gender identity carry increased weight for individuals who belong to other ethnicities, especially if they are transgender:

> If a parent is transgender and is also a migrant, undocumented, or poor, clearly life is more complicated... (Interview n. 10, transgender heterosexual man, Central Italy)

> I report on the case of a Mexican trans woman. I can say with certainty that although she was an established professional... the fact that she was South American, with a Spanish cadence, had a strong influence on the hostility that social services showed toward her. […]

Feeling embarrassed, she told me, "I had to paradoxically prove that I was a Mexican woman, I was an established professional; otherwise, I was a prostitute to them..." (Interview n. 23, transgender bisexual woman, Southern Italy)

With regard to same-sex parenting, to date, Law No. 40/2004, paragraph 3, excludes same-sex couples from having access to medically assisted procreation. More specifically, the Civil Code regarding filiation limits access to fertilization to couples consisting of partners of different genders who are married or cohabiting, of potentially fertile age, and both living, in cases of infertility or sterility. Surrogacy, on the other hand, is inaccessible to all. As a result, many same-sex couples who wish to become parents have no option than to travel abroad to countries where such techniques are permitted. The phenomenon of so-called "reproductive exile" (Matorras, 2005) makes the transition to parenthood for same-sex couples "exclusive" since it requires economic, relational, and even psychological resources that leave out many individuals who do not possess them:

Setting aside the money was not easy, because everything is expensive… the travel, the insemination itself... it's challenging. (Interview n. 3, cisgender bisexual woman, Central Italy)

We spent $140,000 and I am not afraid to tell the whole world. However, people should know that I gave this money to the clinic for the pregnant woman's psychological tests, to the clinic for all the genetic tests, to the clinic for the administration of the hormones needed for oocyte separation, to the clinic for the IVF of the embryos, for the implantation of the embryos. I gave money to four lawyers, four! Because you have to pay the donor's lawyer, the pregnant woman's lawyer, your lawyer, and a fourth lawyer [...]. We also had to pay for the pregnant woman's babysitter, for all the months of her pregnancy... (Interview n. 26, cisgender bisexual man, Southern Italy)

Becoming a father for two men involves a procedure that is certainly longer and certainly a lot more expensive. We must not deny that it is something elitist. (Interview n. 33, cisgender gay man, Northwest Italy)

You have to be financially well-off because it is not a walk in the park today to decide to go to America to have a child. (Interview n. 13, cisgender gay man, Southern Italy)

In addition, in Italy there is no law regulating and protecting parenthood for a same-sex couple. In fact, the Italian legal system only recognizes the responsibility of the biological parent, while the social parent, despite having shared in the procreative project and exercising their parental functions on a daily basis, legally does not exist. Social parents can be legally recognized by resorting to the adoption of their partner's child under Article 44(b). This practice was described by some

participants as high-priced, so much so that some parents declared they were unable to bear the costs:

> From a legal point of view, we are a little bit behind, because I went to the lawyer to inquire about doing the adoption [...]. Now I'm on standby because economically I can't get there, because the lawyer takes €1,500 for the divorce, plus another thousand euros for supporting me with the adoption… and I don't have all this money at the moment. (Interview n. 3, cisgender bisexual woman, Central Italy)

These testimonies support the argument that in Italy the recognition of parenthood for many LGBT people often comes with economic costs, which create fractures between those who have the economic means to proceed and those who live a situation of increased vulnerability due to their socio-economic status.

Placing LGBT Parenting

In some Italian cities, same-sex couples can apply to their municipality for the transcription of both parents on the child's birth certificate. Thus, despite the fact that registering two same-sex parents is contrary to the principles of the Italian legal system, in recent years some "rainbow" mayors have decided to proceed with registering both partners as parents in the civil registry (Corbisiero & Monaco, 2017). The first local transcriptions took place in the cities of Naples and Bologna, prompting other cities to do the same. In other cases, in Pistoia and Trento, for example, administrations have been obliged by the courts to recognize both parents in same-sex couples. In some situations, municipalities' decisions in favor of rainbow families have been challenged by the Public Prosecutor's Office. More recently, the municipal administration of Turin was forced to stop the civil registration of children of same-sex couples following judiciary rulings and communications from the Prefecture of Turin.

On this subject, some of the parents in same-sex couples stated:

> We are lucky because our city is very advanced, thanks to the presence of the mayor. Contrary to national guidelines, he decided to take responsibility and recognize our daughter's American documents and to validate them in our city as well […] (Interview n. 13, cisgender gay man, Southern Italy)

> I live my family life with tranquility because I live in the most modern city in Italy. (Interview n. 15, cisgender lesbian woman, Northwest Italy)

> We turned to the various mayors who succeeded one another in our city for the recognition of our dual parenting, but no one helped us. They made promises to us, but in the end, we got nothing […].

(Interview 28, cisgender woman, lesbian, Southern Italy and Islands)

It should be noted, however, that a particular territory may be inclusive in some situations and not others, depending on the specificities of the parents. Regarding gender, for example, in the city of Milan, the administration headed by Mayor Sala agreed to recognize the parenthood of couples with two mothers, but it took a completely different attitude toward male couples because of the ethical issues around the practice of surrogacy.

Regarding transgender people, the city of Milan recently established a municipal registry to allow them to use their current names on municipal documents, in place of their deadnames. This solution allows transgender people living in Milan to bypass the court or to live their identity freely at the local level pending legal recognition at the national level.

The fragmented scenario that emerged from the data analysis makes it clear that city of residence is another element capable of significantly affecting the well-being and lives of families with LGBT parents (Monaco, 2022b).

Discussion

The research data show that the partial recognition of LGBT parenthood—together with the persistence of common misconceptions due to a lack of knowledge about sexual minorities—is based on certain heterosexist biases still present in the Italian collective imagination. More specifically, for many of the parents interviewed, the still widespread gender binarism and heteronormativity represent the main factors that relegate LGBT parenting to a social position subordinate to dominant family models. Depending on the context, relationship network, and circumstances, the (re)production of privilege and marginalization are further amplified by social institutions.

As highlighted in psychosocial research on these issues, LGBT people—like others belonging to minorities—are exposed to a specific vulnerability factor, defined in the literature as "minority stress" (Meyer, 2003). This condition is not only related to directly lived experiences of discrimination but is also connected to the constant fear that they may experience differential forms of treatment or social inclusion.

This discourse can be further complexified by referring to Crenshaw's theories (1989), according to which all identity components are salient in determining life experiences. In this sense, the study of inequality cannot be accomplished through a one-dimensional reading of subjects. Sharing these assumptions, the study highlighted that the impact of minority stress on Italian LGBT parents is mediated by other personal and environmental factors capable of making some subjects more vulnerable than others. Through the narration of their daily experiences, the LGBT parents who took part in the study also highlighted how certain social categories illuminate their family conditions, in some cases increasing their feelings of vulnerability and uncertainty.

In more detail, the analysis of the interviews highlighted that stigmatizing situational and environmental conditions related to one's minority social status are accompanied by additional cultural and institutional barriers affecting specific groups of parents. So, despite the fact that LGBT people share the experience of defying social expectations related to the stereotype of good parenting—which is linked to a heteronormative view of intimate relationships—a kind of hierarchy among family units is detectable in everyday experiences, with individuals encountering differential levels of acceptance depending on their specific characteristics. Being in a male couple, having limited economic possibilities, facing a transition from female to male gender, or having a different ethnic background are just some of the identity traits that interviewees identified as adding to the general stressors experienced by all LGBT parents living in contemporary Italy.

These different social positions give rise to what could be conceptualized as a "parental disparity," defined as a differentiation among families, which not only affects family visions, expectations, and practices, but in turn also significantly influences how different subgroups of LGBT parents can cope with everyday obstacles and construct their parenting (Greenwood, 2008; Moore, 2012).

The theoretical framework of intersectionality allows to argue that individual social identities are affected differently by power structures over time and are maintained by social and institutional means "oppressing and marginalizing certain bodies based on certain identity categories" (Battle & Ashley, 2008, p. 5).

Several studies (Belsky, 1984; Bradshaw & Donohue, 2014; Jones & Prinz, 2005; Nunes & Ayala-Nunes, 2017; Nunes et al., 2016) agree that parenting can be viewed as the outcome of the interconnection between personal factors (such as parents' psychological and character resources) and contextual elements that are external to the individual (such as sources of stress and support). Therefore, in order to foster better parenting, it is important not only to identify suitable strategies to improve parental resilience through parenting skills training, but more importantly to increase the protective factors and decrease the risk factors present at the cultural and normative levels.

Conclusions and Implications

Adopting an intersectional perspective has allowed for a more rigorous understanding of the various forms of discrimination experienced by Italian LGBT parents. This analysis can be considered a starting point for imagining targeted and, consequently, more effective law enforcement actions.

Indeed, in order to alleviate the effects of intersectional discrimination and mitigate the stigma associated with the multiplication of inequalities, it is necessary to primarily recognize the transversality of the processes of exclusion, oppression, and social segregation.

Such an operation may actually enable a paradigm shift in the direction of deconstructing stereotypes in favor of valuing diversity, thereby ensuring equal solidarity, exchange, sharing, and mutual knowledge between the heterosexual and cisgender majority and the LGBT minority (Flood & Howlson, 2017).

The absence of awareness of these issues currently represents a major critical issue. For example, social services or professionals supporting families may be wholly or partially inadequate if, when they encounter LGBT parents, they are unable to recognize the real difficulties these parents experience and, as a result, fail to respond adequately to their specific needs (Burt et al., 2010; Fitzgerald, 2010; Madonia, 2018; McPhail, 2004; Nealy, 2019; Nothdurfter & Nagy, 2016; O'Neill et al., 2015; Schaub et al., 2017). The lack of or partial knowledge on these issues also makes the interventions less organized, devoid of real effectiveness and usefulness. The research data have also shown that many LGBT parents are aware of various professionals' poor preparation in terms of dealing with intersectional discrimination. This awareness distances many parents from social services, which are seen as additional stressors rather than potential resources. In this sense, operationally, the research data presented here represents a useful tool for professionals in the service of LGBT parents and their families to identify suitable strategies and targeted solutions.

References

Allen, K. R. (2007). Ambiguous loss after lesbian couples with children break up: A case for same-gender divorce. *Family Relations, 56*, 175-183

Allen, K. R. (2015). *Other letters: Hidden diversity among LGBTQ.* London, UK: National Council on Family Relations.

Allen, L. (2015). Queering the academy: New directions in LGBT research in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *34*(4), 681-684.

Allen, S. H., & Mendez, S. N. (2018). Hegemonic heteronormativity: Toward a new era of queer family theory. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 10*(1), 70-86.

Ansell, N. (2016). *Children, Youth and Development*. London, UK: Taylor & Francis.

Baiocco, R., Carone, N., Ioverno, S., & Lingiardi, V. (2018). Same-sex and different-sex parent families in Italy: Is parents' sexual orientation associated with child health outcomes and parental dimensions?. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics, 39*(7), 555-563.

Barbagli, M., & Colombo, A. (2001). *Omosessuali moderni. Gay e lesbiche in Italia*. Bologna, Italy: Il Mulino.

Barbagli, M., & Saraceno, C. (Eds.). (1997). *Lo stato delle famiglie in Italia*. Bologna, Italy: Il Mulino.

Bastianoni P. (2009), Funzioni di cura e genitorialità. *Rivista italiana di educazione familiare, 1*, 37-53.

Battle, J., & Ashley, C. (2008). Intersectionality, heteronormativity, and Black lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) families. *Black Women, Gender & Families, 2*(1), 1-24.

Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development, 55*, 83-96.

Ben-Porat, G., Filc, D., Ozturk, A. E., & Ozzano, L. (2021). Populism, religion and family values policies in Israel, Italy and Turkey. *Mediterranean Politics, 1*, 1-23.

Berkowitz, D. (2009). Theorizing lesbian and gay parenting: Past, present, and future scholarship. *Journal of Family Theory and Review, 1*, 117-132.

Bernini, S. (2008). Family politics: Political rhetoric and the transformation of family life in the Italian Second Republic. *Journal of Modern Italian Studies, 13*(3), 305-324.

Bertone, C. (2015). Il Fascino Discreto delle Famiglie Omogenitoriali. Dilemmi e Responsabilità della Ricerca. *Cambio, V*(9), 37-46.

Bettarini, S. S., & D'Andrea, S. S. (1996). Induced abortion in Italy: levels, trends and characteristics. *Family Planning Perspectives, 1*, 267-277.

Biblarz, T. J., & Savci, E. (2010). Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Families. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72*(3), 480-497.

Boca, D. D., & Saraceno, C. (2005). Le Donne in Italia tra Famiglia e Lavoro. *Economia & lavoro, 39*(1), 125-130.

Boero, M. (2018). *La famiglia della Pubblicità. Stereotipi, Ruoli, Identità*. Milan, Italy: FrancoAngeli.

Bonaccorso, M. (1994). *Mamme e papà omosessuali*. Rome, Italy: Editori Riuniti.

Bosisio, R., & Ronfani, P. (2015). *Le famiglie omogenitoriali. Responsabilità, Regole, Diritti*. Rome, Italy: Carocci.

Bottino, M., & Danna, D. (2005). *La Gaia Famiglia. Che Cos'è l'omogenitorialità*. Trieste, Italy: Asterios.

Bradshaw, K. & Donohue, B. (2014). Parental Satisfaction and Child Maltreatment. In Michalos A. C. (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research* (pp. 199-311). Dordrecht, Holland: Springer.

Burt, T., Gelnaw, A., & Lesser, L. K. (2010). Creating welcoming and inclusive environments for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) families in early childhood settings. *YC Young Children, 65*(1), 97.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Caldwell, L. (1991). *Italian family matters: women, politics and legal reform*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Choo, H. Y., & Ferree, M. M. (2010). Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological Theory, 28*, 129-149.

Cole, B. A. (2009). Gender, narratives and intersectionality: Can personal experience approaches to research contribute to "undoing gender"?. *International Review of Education, 55*(5), 561-578.

Collins, P. H., da Silva, E. C. G., Ergun, E., Furseth, I., Bond, K. D., & Martínez-Palacios, J. (2021). Intersectionality as critical social theory. *Contemporary Political Theory, 20*(3), 690-725.

Coppola, M., & Masullo, G. (2022). *Affettività invisibili: storie e vissuti di persone e Famiglie transgender*. Milan, Italy: PM Edizioni.

Corbisiero, F., & Monaco, S. (2017). *Città arcobaleno. Una mappa della vita omosessuale in Italia*. Rome, Italy: Donzelli.

Corbisiero, F., & Monaco, S. (2021). *Omosessuali Contemporanei. Identità, culture, spazi LGBT+*. Milan, Italy: FrancoAngeli.

Corbisiero, F., & Nocenzi, M. (2022). *Intersezionalità come teoria critica della società*. Milan, Italy: UTET.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1), 139-167.

Crenshaw, K. (1993). Beyond racism and misogyny: Black feminism and 2 Live Crew. In D. Meyers (Ed.), *Feminist social thought: A reader* (pp. 245-263). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cristofari, F. (2007). Autodeterminazione nelle scelte procreative: identità di genere e famiglia. *Medicina e morale, 56*(3).

Danna, D. (1998). *Io ho una bella figlia. Le madri lesbiche raccontano*. Forlì, Italy: Zoe Media.

De Giorgio, M., & Klapisch-Zuber, C. (Eds.). (1996). *Storia del matrimonio*. Rome-Bari, Italy: Laterza.

De Leo, G., & Malagoli Togliatti, M. (1990). La perizia psicologica in età evolutiva. Milan, Italy: Giuffrè.

Di Martino, A. (2020). *Pensiero femminista e tecnologie riproduttive: autodeterminazione, salute, dignità*. Milan, Italy: Mimesis.

Downing, J. B. (2013). Transgender-parent families. In A. E. Goldberg & K. R. Allen (Eds.), *LGBT-parent families: Innovations in research and implications for practice* (pp. 105-116). New York, NY: Springer.

Durkheim, E. (1985). *Les règles de la méthode sociologique*. Paris, France: Éditions F. Alcan.

Ennew, J. (2002). Why the Convention is not about street children (pp. 169-182). In D. Chandler (Ed.). *Revisiting children's rights*. Leida, Holland: Brill Nijhoff.

Eve, P. M., Byrne, M. K., & Gagliardi, C. R. (2014). What is good parenting? The perspectives of different professionals. *Family Court Review, 52*(1), 114-127.

Fargion, S. (2021). Representations of parenting and the neo-liberal discourse: parents' and professionals' views on child-rearing practices in Italy. *Journal of Family Studies, 1*, 1-17.

Ferrari, F. (2020). *La famiglia inattesa: i genitori omosessuali ei loro figli*. Milan, Italy: Mimesis.

Few-Demo, A. L. (2014). Intersectionality as the "new" critical approach in feminist family studies: Evolving racial/ethnic feminisms and critical race theories. *Journal of Family Theory and Review, 6*, 169-183.

Few-Demo, A. L., Humble, A. M., Curran, M. A., & Lloyd S. A. (2016). Queer Theory, Intersectionality, and LGBT-Parent Families: Transformative Critical Pedagogy in Family Theory. *Journal of Family. Theory & Review*, *8*(1), 74-94.

Few-Demo, A. L., Humble, A. M., Curran, M. A., & Lloyd, S. A. (2016). Queer theory, intersectionality, and LGBT-parent families: Transformative critical pedagogy in family theory. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 8*(1), 74-94.

Fitzgerald, T. J. (2010). Queerspawn and their families: Psychotherapy with LGBTQ families. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health, 14*(2), 155-162.

Flood, M., & Howson, R. (Eds.). (2017). Engaging Men in Building Gender Equality. Cambridge, UK: Scholars Publishing.

Franchi, M., & Selmi, G. (2020a). Becoming lesbian mothers in contemporary Italy: The challenge of social and legal constraints. *Elternschaft und Familien jenseits von Heteronormativität und ZweigeschlechtlichkeiT, 1*, 141-155.

Franchi, M., & Selmi, G. (2020b). Same-sex parents negotiating the law in Italy: Between claims of recognition and practices of exclusion. In M. Digoix (Ed.), *Same-sex families and legal recognition in Europe* (pp. 73-94). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Fruggeri, L. (1998). *Famiglie. Dinamiche interpersonali e processi sociali*. Rome, Italy: Carocci.

Gates, G. J. (2015). Marriage and family: LGBT individuals and same-sex couples. *The Future of Children, 1,* 67-87.

Gilley, B., & Masullo, G. (Eds.). (2022). *Non-Binary Family Configurations: Intersections of Queerness and Homonormativity*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Goldberg, A. E., & Allen, K. R. (Eds.) (2020). *LGBTQ-parent families. Innovations in research and implications for practice*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Goldberg, A. E., & Gartrell, N. K. (2014). LGB-parent families: The current state of the research and directions for the future. In J. B. Benson (Ed.), *Advances in child development and behavior* (pp. 57-88). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Elsevier Academic Press.

Greenwood, R. M. (2008). Intersectional political consciousness: Appreciation for intragroup differences and solidarity in diverse groups. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*, 36-47.

Hancock, A. M. (2007). Intersectionality as a normative and empirical paradigm. *Politics & Gender, 3*(2), 248-254.

Hayman, B., Wilkes, L., Halcomb, E., & Jackson, D. (2013). Marginalised mothers: Lesbian women negotiating heteronormative healthcare services. *Contemporary Nurse, 44*(1), 120-127.

Hurtado, A. (2018). Intersectional understandings of inequality. In L. Phillip, J. Hammack (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of social psychology and social justice* (pp. 157-172). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Inhorn, M. C., & Birenbaum-Carmeli, D. (2008). Assisted reproductive technologies and culture change. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 37*, 177-196.

Ioverno, S., Baiocco, R., Lingiardi, V., Verrastro, V., D'Amore, S., & Green, R. J. (2019). Attitudes towards same-sex parenting in Italy: The influence of traditional gender ideology. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 21*(2), 188-204.

ISTAT (2022) *Popolazione e Famiglia*. Rome, Italy: Istituto Italiano di Statistica.

Jones, T., & Ronald, P. (2005). Potential roles of parental self-efficacy in parent and child adjustment: A review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 25*, 341-363.

Kenagy, G. P., & Hsieh, C. M. (2005). Gender differences in social service needs of transgender people. *Journal of Social Service Research, 31*(3), 1-21.

Kertzer, D. I., & Saller, R. P. (Eds.). (1991). *The family in Italy from antiquity to the present*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Kurdek, L. A. (2004). Are gay and lesbian cohabiting couples really different from heterosexual married couples?. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*(4), 880-900.

Kurdek, L. A. (2006). Differences between partners from heterosexual, gay, and lesbian cohabiting couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68*(2), 509-528.

Lasio, D., Serri, F., Ibba, I., & Manuel De Oliveira, J. (2019). Hegemony and heteronormativity: Homonormative discourses of LGBTQ activists about lesbian and gay parenting. *Journal of Homosexuality, 66*(8), 1058-1081.

Lazaridis, G., & Campani, G. (Eds.). (2016). *Understanding the Populist Shift: Othering in a Europe in Crisis (1st ed.)*. London, UK: Routledge.

Leach, E. (1968, 29 January). The Cereal Packet Norm. *The Guardian*.

Lelleri, R., Prati, G., & Pietrantoni, L. (2008). Omogenitorialità: i risultati di una ricerca italiana. *Difesa Sociale, 4*(8), 71-83.

Lev, A. I. (2010). How queer! The development of gender identity and sexual orientation in LGBTQ-headed families. *Family Process, 49*, 268-290.

Lewis, J. A., & Grzanka, P. R. (2016). Applying intersectionality theory to research on perceived racism. In A. N. Alvarez, C. T. H. Liang, & H. A. Neville (Eds.), *The cost of racism for people of color: Contextualizing experiences of discrimination* (pp. 31-54). New York, NY: American Psychological Association.

Ludvig, A. (2006). Differences between women? Intersecting voices in a female narrative. *European Journal of Women's Studies, 13*(3), 245-258.

Madonia, B. (2018). *Orientamento sessuale e identità di genere: Nuove sfide per il servizio sociale*. Trento, Italy: Erickson.

Magalhães, M., Aparicio-García, M. E., & García-Nieto, I. (2020). Transition trajectories: Contexts, difficulties and consequences reported by young transgender and non-binary spaniards. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(18), 6859.

Matorras, R. (2005). Reproductive Exile versus Reproductive Tourism. *Human Reproduction, 20*(12), 35-71.

McCall, L. (2005). The Complexity of Intersectionality. *Signs, 30*(3), 1771-1800.

McPhail, B. A. (2004). Questioning Gender and Sexuality Binaries: What Queer Theorists, Transgendered Individuals, and Sex Researchers Can Teach Social work. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services, 17*(1), 3-21.

Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 674-697.

Monaco, S. (2022a). Italian Same-sex Parenting in Times of COVID-19: Constructing Parenthood on Insecure Grounds. *Family Relations, 71*(2), 463-474.

Monaco, S. (2022b). Practicing Urban Citizenship in Contemporary Italy: Policies, Practices, and Spaces for Same-Sex Parent Families. *Fuori luogo. Rivista di Sociologia del Territorio, Turismo, Tecnologia*, XI.

Monaco, S., & Nothdurfter, U. (2021a). Discovered, Made Visible, Constructed, and Left out: LGBT+ Parenting in the Italian Sociological Debate. *Journal of Family Studies*, *1*, 1-18.

Monaco, S., & Nothdurfter, U. (2021b). Stuck under the Rainbow? Gay Parents' Experiences with Transnational Surrogacy and Family Formation in Times of COVID-19 Lockdown. *Italian Sociological Review, 11*(2), 509-529.

Moore, M. R. (2012). Intersectionality and the study of Black, sexual minority women. *Gender & Society*, *26*, 33-39.

Moore, M. R., & Stambolis-Ruhstorfer, M. (2013). LGBT sexuality and families at the start of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Sociology, 39*, 491-507.

Morgan, D. (2011). *Rethinking Family Practices*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Morlicchio, E., & Pirone, F. (2015). I lavoratori sul piano inclinato della crisi. *Il Mulino, 64*(3), 462-467.

Naldini, M. & Saraceno, C. (2011). *Conciliare famiglia e lavoro. Vecchi e nuovi patti tra sessi e generazioni*. Bologna, Italy: Il Mulino.

Nealy, E. C. (2019). Working with LGBT families. In M. McGoldrick & K. V. Hardy (Eds.), *Re-visioning family therapy: Addressing diversity in clinical practice* (pp. 363-387). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Nothdurfter, U., & Nagy, A. (2016) Few and Far from Radical? LGBT-Related Contributions in European Social work Journal Publishing. *British Journal of Social Work, 46*(8), 2227-2244.

Nunes, C., & Ayala-Nunes. L. (2017). Parenting sense of competence in at psychosocial risk families and child well-being. *Bordón, Revista de Pedagogía, 16*, 155-168.

Nunes, C., Jiménez, L., Menéndez, S. Ayala-Nunes, L. & Hidalgo, V. (2016). Psychometric properties of an adapted version of the parental sense of competence (PSOC) scale for Portuguese at-risk parents'. *Child & Family Social Work, 21*(571), 433-441.

O'Neill, B. J., Swan, T. A., & Mulé N. J. (Eds.). (2015). *Lgbtq People and Social work: Intersectional Perspectives*. Toronto, Canada: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Oakley, A. (1982). Conventional families. In R.N. Rapoport, M.P. Fogarty and R. Rapoport (Eds.). *Families in Britain*. London, UK: Routledge.

Oswald, R. F. (2000). A member of the wedding? Heterosexism and family ritual. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *17*, 349-368.

Oswald, R. F., Kuvalanka, K. A., Blume, L. B., & Berkowitz, D. (2009). Queering "the family". In S. A. Lloyd, A. L. Few, & K. R. Allen (Eds.), *Handbook of feminist family studies* (pp. 43-55). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Parisi, R. (2018). Filiazione e genitorialità fra pratiche, rappresentazioni e diritto: il caso dell'omogenitorialità in Italia. *EtnoAntropologia, 5*(2), 135-168.

Park, S. M. (2013). *Mothering queerly, queering motherhood: Resisting monomaternalism in adoptive, lesbian, blended, and polygamous families*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.

Passerini, L. (1996). *Autobiography of a generation: Italy, 1968*. Wesleyan, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Pistella, J., Tanzilli, A., Ioverno, S., Lingiardi, V., & Baiocco, R. (2018). Sexism and attitudes toward same-sex parenting in a sample of heterosexuals and sexual minorities: The mediation effect of sexual stigma. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 15*(2), 139-150.

Prins, B. (2006). Narrative accounts of origins. *European Journal of Women's Studies, 13*(2), 277-290.

Reczek, C. (2020). Sexual- and gender-minority families: A 2010 to 2020 decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 82*(1), 300-325.

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. London, UK: Sage.

Ruspini, E. & Inghilleri, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Transessualità e scienze Sociali. Identità di genere nella postmodernità*. Naples, Italy: Liguori.

Ryan, C. (2009). *Helping families support their lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) children*. Washington, DC: National Center for Cultural Competence, Georgetown University Center for Child and Human Development.

Saraceno, C. (2017). *L'equivoco della famiglia*. Rome-Bari, Italy: Laterza.

Schaub, J., Willis, P., & Dunk-West, P. (2017). Accounting for Self, Sex and Sexuality in UK Social workers' Knowledge Base: Findings from an Exploratory Study. *British Journal of Social Work, 47*(2), 427-446.

Steinberg, L. D. (2004). *The ten basic principles of good parenting*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Tarozzi, M. (2008). *Che cos'è la Grounded Theory*. Rome, Italy: Carocci.

Tavory, I., & Timmermans, S. (2014). *Abductive analysis: Theorizing qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Therborn, G. (2004). *Between sex and power: Family in the world 1900-2000*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Trappolin, L. (2016). The construction of lesbian and gay parenthood in sociological research. A critical analysis of the international literature. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Family Studies, XXI*, 41-59.

Trappolin, L., & Tiano, A. (2019). *Diventare genitori, diventare famiglia. Madri lesbiche e padri gay in Italia tra innovazione e desiderio di normalità*. Padua, Italy: CEDAM.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2011). *The Politics of Belonging: Intersectional Contestations*. London, UK: Sage.

Zanatta, A. L. (2008). *Le nuove famiglie*. Bologna, Italy: Il Mulino.