
AN INTERGENERATIONAL SUMMER PROGRAM INVOLVING PERSONS WITH DEMENTIA AND PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

Christina Gigliotti
Matt Morris
Sara Smock
Shannon E. Jarrott
Bonnie Graham

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia, USA

We implemented an intergenerational (IG) summer program at a collocated site for 2 consecutive summers to maximize continuity and enhance sustainability. We incorporated multiple methods to represent the views of key program stakeholders, including staff and administrators, parents who attended the program, and facilitators' reports of the experiences of child and adult participants. We generated a list of themes and sub-themes from each source and triangulated the data points. Despite the resources invested and the challenges faced, the program was well received and viewed as beneficial. These findings offer insight into the likelihood of sustainability for IG summer programming.

As the population ages and competition for social program funds increases, practitioners and policymakers are beginning to give intergenerational (IG) programming increasing levels of attention (Deutschman, Bruno, & Jarrott, 2003). IG programming unites older adults (65+) and children/youth under the age of 21 in mutually beneficial interactions fostered by a carefully planned program of activities. IG programs should be particularly desirable to funders because they provide the potential to address a range of community members' needs simultaneously and cost-effectively (Chamberlain,

Address correspondence to Christina Gigliotti, Department of Human Development, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061-0416. E-mail: cgigliott@vt.edu

Fetterman, & Maher, 1994; Goyer, 2001; Hayden, 2003; Henkin & Kingson, 1998; Kuehne, 1998).

In an ongoing effort to build community connections between a colocated adult day service (ADS) program and child development lab school (CDLS) for preschool children, a summer IG program was offered for the first time. Tenets of the contact theory (Pettigrew, 1998) inform IG programming at the shared site intergenerational program (SSIP). These tenets include: (a) support for contact from key stakeholders, (b) equal group status of contact members, (c) contact characterized by cooperation, (d) goal-directed contact, and (e) the opportunity for disparate contact members to build friendships. Because the CDLS closes for 4 months during the summer, continuity of friendship-building opportunities is extremely limited. In response to this challenge, and in an effort to increase support from family stakeholders, administrators coordinated a 13-week summer IG program that provided children and older adults from the two programs with the opportunity to maintain and further develop relationships established during the regular school year.

We utilized a theory and evidence-based approach in planning, implementing, and evaluating the summer IG program. The perspectives of various stakeholders, including parents, administrators, facilitators, and program staff were solicited to provide insight regarding the program's organization, implementation, and sustainability. Data were systematically analyzed to determine the feasibility, sustainability, and effectiveness of the summer IG program. The information gathered from these sources encouraged and informed the next year's summer program. The insights and suggestions obtained from our longitudinal evaluation, which assessed processes, outcomes, and perceptions of the summer IG program can be applied to IG programs in a multitude of settings as programmers and evaluators develop innovative programs of their own.

IG scholars and practitioners seek program opportunities that can simultaneously benefit aging adults and children/youth (Newman, Ward, Smith, Wilson, & McCrea, 1997). Short- and long-term IG programs have revealed both benefits and challenges (Camp et al., 1997; Jarrott & Bruno, 2003; Osborne & Bullock, 2000; Salari, 2002). Older adult participants in IG programs have experienced increased positive affect (Jarrott & Bruno, 2003; Short-DeGraff & Diamond, 1996), engagement (Camp et al., 1997), and generational empathy (Hayes, 2003). In addition, children/youth benefit socially and cognitively from interactions with senior members of society according to research (Hayes, 2003; Stanton & Tench, 2003) and sociocultural developmental theory (Vygotsky, 1978). Furthermore,

collaboration that meets the developmental needs of participants contributes to program sustainability (Mancini & Marek, 2004).

Informed by contact theory (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998), we expected that IG relationships between children and older adults would benefit from frequent and regular opportunities for positive interaction. Contact theory is comprised of four tenets that speak to the conditions necessary to foster positive relationships between members of two disparate groups (Allport, 1954). The first tenet involves *authority support* from key stakeholders, custom, and tradition that institutionalize and legitimize intergroup interactions. *Equal group status* of contact members refers to the perceptions that program participants have regarding their status in the relationship and the understanding that they, as well as the other group's members, are valued members of the community. Optimal contact between disparate group members should be characterized by *cooperation* and interdependence rather than competition. Groups coming together to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes characterize the fourth tenet of *goal-directed* contact. Finally, Pettigrew (1998) added a fifth essential condition of the opportunity to build *friendships* through regular contact over time. Programming and evaluation were informed by these tenets as we brought the two groups together.

Despite the positive outcomes commonly reported by IG researchers, opportunities for IG contact do not always yield positive results. Salari (2002) identified the negative influence of IG activities that were age-appropriate for the child participants but inappropriate for older adult clients of ADS programs. The older adults who were infantilized during the IG programming experienced poorer child-adult interactions and more frequently displayed withdrawal from the IG opportunity. One team of researchers cautioned against implementing structured or product-focused IG activities with adults possessing dementia (Griff, Lambert, Dellman-Jenkins, & Fruit, 1996) because of the physical and cognitive limitations exhibited by the elders. Unsuccessful IG outcomes may result when facilitators do not use theory- and evidence-based practices (Orthner & Bowen, 2004), or when they fail to adequately evaluate their program outcomes (Lavee & Dollahite, 1991). Consequently, IG programmers must be aware of the potential challenges as well as the potential benefits of IG contact.

Caspi (1984) first used *contact theory* to inform IG research when he assessed the attitudes of children in an IG program involving older adults as care workers. The children who had frequent and regular contact with the older adult aides had more positive attitudes towards older adults compared to a comparable group of children without

such contact. Caspi concluded that the frequent and regular opportunities for interaction were central to the children's positive experiences. Contact theory similarly informed implementation of the current project.

Even among high-quality IG programs, practitioners face a formidable challenge of sustainability, as few programs last beyond two years (Hamilton, Brown, Alonzo, Glover, Mersereau & Wilson, 1999). Often administrators view IGP as an add-on that is optional rather than a core element of the program (Deutchman et al., 2003). Frequently, when a staff person who initiated a site's IG program leaves an organization or changes roles, the opportunity for contact between children/youth and elders often leaves with her/him.

One might expect, similarly, that an IG program with extended breaks could face challenges to its sustainability and effectiveness. We implemented an IG summer program at a SSIP involving an ADS program and CDLS that supports regular interaction between program participants during the school year (approximately twice per week for each of four children's classrooms). The lab school is closed for four months each summer, and previously there have been no scheduled opportunities for the participants to continue the relationships they developed during the school year. The current paper represents one effort to use evidence-based practice and theory to implement a program designed to support broad IG community goals (i.e. enhanced sustainability, stakeholder investment, and community capacity) as well as programmatic goals (i.e., meaningful activities for adults and children and continuity of relationships).

Our multifaceted, multilayered evaluation of the summer IG program was guided by Bronfenbrenner's work (1986), which emphasized the contextual environment and the importance of including multiple levels of analyses. Specifically, we examined multiple layers within a system (the SSIP) through evaluations at each level of the system. The researchers evaluated key individuals in various positions at the summer IG program. This was done to gather a systemic perspective of factors that support and sustain the IG programming and factors that may challenge its sustainability.

METHOD

Summer IG Program

Over the course of the summer in 2003, two graduate assistants (GAs), studying human development at each end of the age continuum, planned, facilitated, and evaluated IG activities, designed

to support the biopsychosocial well-being of both client groups. The program was conducted four days a week for 10 weeks over a 13-week period. Three 1-week breaks in the program calendar were scheduled for the 4th of July holiday and training conferences attended by program staff. The activities took place in a variety of settings, including an IG studio connecting the ADS to the CDLS, the ADS, and the outdoor ADS patio. ADS participants represented a wide range of cognitive and functional abilities, although most had dementia. Adult participation in the summer IG program ranged from one adult to the entire client population of 14 clients.

We created a schedule for children from each of the CDLS classrooms to attend the summer program on a different day of the week (e.g., the 3-year-old classroom was scheduled for Mondays). We scheduled the classrooms so that children of similar ages would attend the program on a given day and they would be able to visit with their friends; however, children ended up attending the program as family schedules permitted, occasionally accompanied by younger or older siblings. Children ranged in age from 2 to 10 years old, and numbered from zero to 10, but the sessions typically included 3 to 5 children. The children also represented a heterogeneous group in terms of ethnicity. A child's parent or caregiver was required to attend the free IG sessions to insure adequate supervision. Mothers, fathers, and babysitters attended the program with the children and assumed various roles during the program.

The IG program incorporated a range of evidence-based practices to facilitate positive IG interactions. For example, to encourage IG cooperation and friendship formation, children and seniors were typically paired to complement each other's abilities. This approach has proven effective in previous research (Camp et al., 1997; Gladwell, 2003). Additionally, modifications were preplanned for diverse activities including gardening, music, arts and crafts, reading, and games in order to support participant success and continued involvement (Camp, 1999). If the activity proved too difficult for a child-adult pair, the participants were given a simpler version of the task or a smaller part of the collective whole. Participant pairs who found an activity easy were often given more responsibility and asked to assist participants requiring more help. Participation in any IG opportunity was always voluntary for children and seniors alike.

Participants

To evaluate the program, the research team incorporated the various perspectives of key stakeholders in the summer IG program.

We included four administrators in the evaluation: two from the CDLS and two from the ADS. Also included were the four ADS staff persons who worked during the summer IG program. We also included the perspective of 10 parents who attended the IG sessions and were willing to complete and return the evaluation.

Measures

To holistically assess the effectiveness and sustainability of the IG summer program, we synthesized the perceptions of key stakeholders—representing multiple levels of analysis. Evaluation methods included independent interviews, surveys, and evaluation forms.

Interviews

We conducted semi structured interviews with staff and administrators. Each interview lasted between 30 minutes and 1 hour. The interviewers explored each individual's definition of effectiveness relevant to IG programming, as well as the benefits and costs (both tangible and intangible) associated with the IG summer program. Interviewers sought to understand whether respondents would like to see the program continue and, if so, whether they were willing to support it in the future. All eight of the interviews were recorded and transcribed by the interviewer to ensure the most accurate representation of the respondents' views.

Evaluation Forms

Following each IG activity, the facilitators completed an evaluation form to describe the activity goals and procedures as well as the benefits and challenges associated with the session. This information provided supplementary data regarding the experiences of the adults and children, and also provided insights about the effectiveness of the activity for facilitating IG relationships.

Parent Survey

At the program's culmination, parents were asked to complete an open-ended survey about their expectations and satisfaction related to the program. Parents also indicated whether their child had benefited from the program and described any special relationships that developed between their child and an older adult through the program. Open-ended surveys were used to increase confidentiality and elicit open responses.

ANALYSIS

Interviews

The interviewers read and reread their transcripts thoroughly to identify themes that emerged from the data. Each interviewer then listed themes and subthemes in their transcripts. We then discussed our themes and identified those that were common across the interviews, concluding with a parsimonious list of themes and subthemes. Each interviewer used the finalized list of themes and subthemes to recode their transcript and insure that valuable information was not lost in collapsing the codes. The interviewers then identified quotes from their interviews that resonated with the coding scheme in order to enhance data transparency and, hence, the credibility of findings.

Surveys and Evaluation Forms

The researchers used the same procedures described above to analyze the open-ended parent surveys and facilitator evaluation forms. The findings that emerged from these data were compared to the coding scheme developed for the stakeholder interviews. The researchers created a table of major themes and subthemes to aid in triangulation of the data and consolidate the information gathered from all four layers of the ecological system to inform the evaluation process (see Appendix).

Triangulating these various data sources enhanced the rigor of the evaluation by increasing the credibility (internal validity), confirmability (objectivity), and dependability (reliability) of the findings (Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002).

RESULTS

From the data collected, five major themes emerged through the coding and analysis processes. The themes included: (a) intended goals, (b) actual benefits of the program, (c) costs or inputs, (d) challenges, and (e) future goals. We used these themes to organize and group the data.

Intended Goals

From intended goals, we identified two subthemes: relational and programmatic goals. Almost everyone interviewed identified a

relational goal for the summer IG project. For example, interviewees mentioned that they wanted to support efforts to create or foster positive interactions between the older adult and child participants. The program achieved this goal as members became more comfortable around each other. This created what one respondent called, “a fun learning environment” that enriched both the adults’ and children’s lives. Bonding between the generations stimulated participants’ (children, parents, and older adult clients) memories of children, grandchildren, and grandparents and promoted acceptance of each other. For example, one respondent mentioned, “My father had Alzheimer’s. I know this interaction is important for both children and adults.” Perhaps most important, the summer IG program encouraged continuity of relationships between the spring and fall school semesters.

Interviewees also described programmatic goals. Researcher and program director respondents were interested in determining the feasibility of such a program for the future. One person commented, “The goal is to get [IG] so that we are doing this as part of a normal thing, [IG] is what we do.” Another goal was mutual, sustained support from both the CDLS and ADS. This would, in part, pave the way for continued community building between the programs. In addition to the regular IG program, the summer IG program would provide forum for outreach to caregivers and parents by helping these respective groups become more comfortable around each other.

Continuity of services has both programmatic and relational effects with implications for both centers. IG activities previously ceased at the ADS during the summer months due to the CDLS vacation. One respondent noted, “[it is important] that we will continue to have IG activities over the summer, that we can market [IG programming], and that we can give our participants that kind of activity [year round].” The summer IG program is one potential solution to these interruptions.

Benefits

Program benefits emerged as the second major theme. Benefits of the summer IG program were numerous and widespread. Many of the benefits identified by interviewees directly related to the intended goals outlined above and can be classified into the subthemes of programmatic and relational benefits.

A programmatic benefit of the IG program was its attractiveness to clients, including ADS caregivers, CDLS parents, and their family

member participants. Interviewees expressed the belief that the IG program provided a competitive edge for enrolling new clients. Summer IG, specifically, created continuity of activities that affected the marketing of the programs and directly influenced program sustainability. The program further increased research potential within and between the two centers. This potential created an increased willingness of graduate students to be involved with the planning and facilitation of IG activities. One person noted, "I think it is potentially a huge benefit, just the research potential..."

Relationship benefits of the program were also numerous. The summer IG program demonstrated a good match between two distinct client populations. Staff said that children were able to learn empathy while becoming more accepting and tolerant, and less judgmental of others. As a parent commented, "By the end of the summer [my daughter] was asking when she would be able to see the neighbors [friends from ADS] again. I also noticed a change with [my daughter] with our seniors at church; overcoming shyness with this group." Many of the older adult participants were pleased to be interacting with the children. The resultant synergy created an enjoyable, beneficial environment. Strong bonds and special relationships developed between certain adults and children who would look for their friends from the other center. One parent reported, "Our daughter seemed attached to George (all names have been changed to pseudonyms). She usually told her father all about George and how he helped her with an art project or work with chalk outside." Some interviewees suggested that a surrogate grandparent/grandchild relationship developed. The children responded to the encouragement of the adults while the adults enjoyed the company of the children. This affirmed both participant groups' sense of self and enhanced their quality of life.

While the summer IG program enhanced relationships between participants, it also affected other key stakeholders. Relationships were nurtured between ADS staff and CDLS staff, as well as between staff and parents or caregivers. Success of the summer IG program required that staff from various programs and backgrounds communicate, cooperate, and work together. The IG program enabled ADS staff to be a part of the community building and research efforts, which promoted and increased staff professional development and sense of self. This was largely due to the quieter environment afforded by the summer months, as fewer graduate and undergraduate students were present at ADS. Consequently, ADS staff members found it easier to integrate themselves into the IG programming.

Costs or Inputs

The third major theme embedded in the data was costs and inputs of the program. The summer IG program required several tangible and intangible costs or inputs from both the CDLS and ADS. The summer IG program required supplies and materials for many of the activities. Most of these were readily available and donated by one of the centers. Funding to pay facilitators was provided primarily by the CDLS and departmental support. The ADS and affiliated faculty contributed additional funding, supplies, and staff support.

Challenges

The fourth theme that emerged was challenges associated with the summer IG program. Challenges included logistical concerns, participant characteristics, and promotion of stakeholder buy-in.

Specific logistical issues challenged the summer IG program. Summers are typically a busy time filled with family vacations and summer camps for children. Consequently, scheduling and attendance was always on the facilitators' minds. Facilitators had little certainty about which children would attend from day to day or week to week. As one interviewee stated, "There were some days that nobody showed up and that was kind of disappointing for the participants and we had to manage that disappointment and come up with something else for them to do."

The unique characteristics of the respective participants added challenges to summer IG programming as well. As one respondent commented, "We needed people from [the ADS] who understood the adults and we also needed people from the [CDLS] who could work with the parents and could encourage the children's participation." Adult participants, particularly those with more profound disabilities or cognitive impairment, presented distinct challenges. For example, some of the older adults demonstrated impatience and frustration during the IG opportunities. Others could not express effectively, either verbally or behaviorally, their enjoyment of IG experiences.

The child attendees also presented specific challenges. Mixed age groups, sibling participants, and various developmental abilities required careful, strategic planning. Because of the participants' unique personality characteristics, staff reported that they had to be intentional about pairing the adults and children in order to maximize positive interaction. At times this was difficult and frustrating due to the inconsistent attendance of the children. Furthermore,

while the facilitators encouraged parents to participate in the activities, the parents' presence could enhance or hinder interactions between participants. For example, if a parent became over-involved with his/her child, the older adult partner would often miss out on the opportunity for interaction. One parent articulated this dynamic by stating, "It inhibited interaction as my child sought my help more than the older adults'."

Issues related to staff also presented significant challenges. Staff turnover among IG facilitators and support staff created a need for ongoing training and promotion of staff "buy-in" to the program. Staff from both centers questioned their role in IG programs. Often times, this role was not clearly understood. One administrator discussed the challenge of obtaining staff buy-in by stating, "There is a real sense in the staff here—and it's ingrained from a long time ago—that sort of their job ends at the door, and they're not really part of anything else that goes on in the building."

Finally, challenges that related to communication and mutuality between programs emerged. Communication related to both planning and facilitating the IG activities and the project research goals. Mutual investment of the CDLS and ADS administration and staff related specifically to equitability. One way to demonstrate investment was to share equally in the costs and in-kind support of the program. Mutual investment also related to mutual respect for the needs, priorities, and accreditation standards of the other program. Respondents from both programs indicated that equal support, either through funding or administrative support, was not always present.

Future Vision

A final theme included visions and goals for future IG programming, which incorporated programmatic and logistical concerns as well as an increase in stakeholder support. Attendance and planning were major concerns requiring attention. Parents and administrators identified this as the most significant area for improvement. One interviewee commented, "I think we need to be really clear about when we're doing [the summer IG program]." Suggestions included preenrollment and charging a fee to increase commitment. IG programming should continue to be flexible, allowing for informal interaction separate from the planned IG opportunities. For example, a child participant might leave the planned group activity to initiate an individual interaction with an older adult participant.

The overwhelming feeling from the interviewees was that the summer IG program, with some modifications and enhancements, should

continue. This may include negotiating equal funding and support from both the ADS and CDLS. Likewise, support should be fostered among stakeholders, including administrators, staff, students, caregivers, parents, and participants. Specifically, because staff turnover is typically high at adult day facilities and student involvement is tied to the academic year, on-going IG training is required to provide program representatives with appropriate skills and knowledge. One administrator spoke to the specialized training required to sustain the IG program when she stated, "It's going to be like starting all over again next year when most of the head teachers will be gone and staff will be gone. So I think it's a matter of how we are going to build into our infrastructure a cycle of education and reeducation that both sides need to have." To that end, several of the respondents indicated that the creation of an IG coordinator staff position that represents both programs would enhance continuity, staff training, and issues related to buy in.

Respondents appreciated the capacity for IG programming and facilitators to respect individual participants. One administrator further added that sustainability of IG programming would depend on continued implementation of flexible, developmentally appropriate activities based on emergent participant interests. Respondents indicated that by continuing and building upon effective practices, positive intergenerational contact would continue and the community would continue to grow.

CONCLUSION

In conducting this evaluation, we sought to assess the feasibility, sustainability, and effectiveness of an IG summer program involving older adults with care needs and preschool-aged children at a SSIP. Our multimethod assessment was informed by Bronfenbrenner's (1986) model, which emphasizes the importance of the interrelationships between the varied layers of each individual's contextual environment. Our query incorporated data from the microlevel of Bronfenbrenner's model to capture the adults' and children's experiences during the summer IG program, which is typically where the analysis has ended (Newman et al., 1997; Stremmel, Travis, Kelly-Harrison, & Hensley, 1994; Xaverius & Matthews, 2004). Also included in the microlevel system are the children's parents, who attended the sessions with their children and experienced the IG programming first hand. We expanded the level of analysis by including ADS staff, who represent mesolevel perspectives. Finally, inclusion of the program directors' and administrators from both programs

represent the macrolevel of Bronfenbrenner's model. As a result, we gained a more comprehensive assessment of program effectiveness and sustainability.

Evidence-based practices informed the current study, and were subsequently used to inform a second year of programming. In 2004, the IG program's scheduling, staffing, and evaluation methods were modified to address concerns and suggestions identified in 2003. To address the parents' mixed feelings about their mandatory attendance, additional staff support was solicited and parents were given the choice of attending. To address scheduling concerns, parents registered in advance for certain days and indicated when they would be away for vacation or other preplanned events. Rather than completing evaluation sheets, the facilitators journaled about their experiences and their efforts to facilitate interactions between the generations. Purposeful attendance to evidence- and theory-based practices enhances program sustainability, as these practices have demonstrated success in other settings. Their application to the summer IG program has resulted in gains for program participants, increased program interdependence, and stakeholder buy-in (Lavee & Dollahite, 1991; Orthner & Bowen, 2004).

The current investigation is one building block in a larger project designed to foster community capacity between these two programs (Bowen, Orthner, Martin, & Mancini, 2001; Jarrott, Camp, & Travis, 2004). Community capacity represents a sense of shared responsibility and competence among community members (Mancini, Bowen, & Martin, 2003). The IG summer program fostered community capacity by linking the children and adults in mutually supportive interactions, by involving parents in the IG sessions, and by soliciting stakeholder feedback during the planning and evaluation process.

Contact theory informed our approach in planning, implementing, and evaluating the summer IG program. Optimizing opportunities for regular, ongoing interactions between child and adult participants was a primary goal of the program, which contributes to Pettigrew's (1998) added tenet, *opportunity for friendship development*. Contact theory also points to the importance of gaining *support from authority figures* and tradition. We garnered authority support by seeking parent, administrator, and staff input. A tradition of IG programming was strengthened by institutionalizing year-long IG programming. Finally, the contact theory tenets of *cooperative interactions* characterized by a *common goal* were supported by facilitators' efforts to provide meaningful provocations requiring interdependence among child and senior participants.

Because the CDLS is typically closed during the summer months and staffing issues were a concern, parents' participation enabled groups of children to maintain contact with their school environment, their peers, their older adult neighbors, and program staff. Key stakeholders from both programs, including the children's parents, viewed this continuity as an important program outcome. Increased comfort and the opportunity to form friendships was facilitated through regular contact, which also helped strengthen the tradition of IG interactions.

As the level of IG programming between the two sites has varied historically, feedback from each participant community member was essential in determining the perceived effectiveness of the summer program. Such perspectives also offered insight into the program's sustainability because stakeholders revealed their level of commitment to IG programming. Our interviews with the program administrators attempted to capture the value that program representatives placed on the IG component of their programming. We found that their program marketing often incorporated the IG component because it was viewed as a unique asset to their service repertoire.

At the microlevel, the facilitators continually and purposefully considered *common goals* as they planned and presented the IG activities. They chose activities that were developmentally and generationally appropriate for both groups. Additionally, they presented activities that emphasized cooperation between the generations to achieve a common goal and optimize interactions and the formation of relationships. The facilitators adopted a strengths approach when planning activities for these two groups. This was done to capitalize on existing strengths and abilities and minimize deficits (Bowlby Sifton, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978). In this sense, the facilitators worked to achieve *equal group status* between the two groups by treating each person as a unique individual with something valuable to contribute to the group, the activity, and the community as a whole.

LESSONS LEARNED

Evaluation techniques provided a holistic view of the IG summer program from multiple perspectives and helped us identify the costs or challenges as well as the benefits associated with IG programming. A variety of challenges were identified by the open and honest feedback provided by the range of respondents. The majority of challenges were logistical in nature, relating to issues of attendance, scheduling, and the wide range of ability levels. Soliciting this information helped us to focus our planning efforts for the following year.

We overcame some of the challenges from the first year's program by making the program more structured in terms of the age groups that were invited to attend the sessions on any given day. We also required parents to enroll in the program ahead of time and maintain contact with the facilitators regarding absenteeism. We also learned that some children's parents were not able to attend the IGP with them, but still sought the benefits of the IGP. Therefore, we did not require parental attendance and compensated for this by increasing the number of IG facilitators. Although parental attendance contributed to authority support, many of the parents felt that their involvement may have limited the degree to which their child was willing to interact with and seek help from the elders when they had the option of their parents for support. Despite these challenges, the majority of respondents, representing a wide range of roles, agreed that the program should be continued in the future. They felt that the significant benefits realized by the children, adults, and attractiveness of both programs outweighed the costs and inputs required to implement the program. We also learned that continuity of interactions facilitates progress towards the long-term goal of sustainability, as the program's visibility was enhanced, the stakeholders were involved, and the participants continued to benefit through meaningful relationships with one another.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Anfara, V. A., Brown, K. M., & Mangione, T. L. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. *Educational Researcher*, 31(7), 28–38.
- Bowen, G. L., Orthner, D. K., Martin, J. A., & Mancini, J. A. (2001). *Building community capacity: A manual for U.S. Air Force family support centers*. Chapel Hill, NC: A Better Image Printing.
- Bowlby Sifton, C. (2000). Maximizing the functional ability of persons with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias. In M. P. Lawton & R. L. Rubinstein (Eds.), *Interventions in dementia care toward improving quality of life* (pp. 11–38). New York: Springer.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, 22, 723–742.
- Camp, C. J. (1999). *Montessori-based activities for persons with dementia: Vol. 1*. Beachwood, OH: Menorah Park Center for the Aging.
- Camp, C. J., Judge, K. S., Bye, C. A., Fox, K. M., Bowden, J., Bell, J. M., Valencic, K., & Mattern, J. M. (1997). An intergenerational program for persons with dementia using Montessori methods. *The Gerontologist*, 37, 688–692.
- Caspi, A. (1984). Contact hypothesis and inter-age attitudes: A field study of cross-age contact. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47, 74–80.

- Chamberlain, V. M., Fetterman, E., & Maher, M. (1994). Innovation in elder and child care: An intergenerational experience. *Educational Gerontology, 19*, 193–204.
- Deutchman, D. E., Bruno, K. A., & Jarrott, S. E. (2003). Young at heart: Intergenerational activities involving persons with dementia. *Activities Directors' Quarterly for Alzheimer's & Other Dementia Patients, 4*(2), 27–35.
- Gladwell, M. (2003). *Intergenerational programming involving elders with dementia: An observational assessment*. Unpublished master's thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, Virginia.
- Goyer, A. (2001). Intergenerational shared site and shared resource programs: Current models. (Available from Generations United, 122 C St., NW, Suite 820, Washington, DC 20001-2109).
- Griff, M., Lambert, D., Dellmann-Jenkins, M., & Fruit, D. (1996). Intergenerational activity analysis with three groups of older adults: Frail, community-living, and Alzheimer's. *Educational Gerontology, 22*, 601–612.
- Hamilton, G., Brown, S., Alonzo, T., Glover, M., Mersereau, Y., & Wilson, P. (1999). Building community for the long term: An intergenerational commitment. *The Gerontologist, 39*, 235–240.
- Hayden, C. D. (2003). *Financial analysis & considerations for replication of the ONE-generation (ONE) intergenerational daycare program*. Oakland, CA: National Economic Development and Law Center.
- Hayes, C. (2003). An observational study in developing an intergenerational shared site program: Challenges and insights. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships, 1*(1), 113–132.
- Henkin, N., & Kingson, E. (1998). Advancing an intergenerational agenda for the twenty-first century. [Electronic version]. *Generations, 22*, 99–105.
- Jarrott, S. E., Camp, C. J., & Travis, S. (2004, November). *Building community at a shared-site intergenerational program*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Gerontological Society of America, Washington, D.C.
- Jarrott, S. E. & Bruno, K. A. (2003). Intergenerational activities involving persons with dementia: An observational assessment. *American Journal of Alzheimer's and Related Diseases, 18*, 31–38.
- Kuehne, V. S. (1998). Building intergenerational communities through research and evaluation. *Generations, 29*, 1–6.
- Lavee, Y. & Dollahite, D. C. (1991). The linkage between theory and research in family science. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53*, 361–373.
- Mancini, J. A., Bowen, G. & Martin, J. A. (2003). Community capacity. In T. Gullotta & M. Bloom (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Primary Prevention and Health Promotion* (pp. 319–331). New York, NY: Plenum.
- Mancini, J. A. & Marek, L. I. (2004). Sustaining community-based programs for families: Conceptualization and measurement. *Family Relations, 33*, 339–347.
- Newman, S., Ward, C. R., Smith, T. B., Wilson, J. O., & McCrea, J. M. (1997). *Intergenerational programs: Past, present, and future*. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Orthner, D. K. & Bowen, G. L. (2004). Strengthening practice through results management. In A. R. Roberts & K. Yeager (Eds.), *Handbook of practice-focused research and evaluation* (pp. 897–904). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Osborne, S. S. & Bullock, J. R. (2000). Intergenerational programming in action: Befrienders. *Educational Gerontology*, 26, 169–182.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. [Electronic version]. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65–85.

Salari, S. (2002). Intergenerational partnerships in adult day centers: Importance of age-appropriate environments and behaviors. *The Gerontologist*, 42, 321–333.

Short-DeGraff, M. A. & Diamond, K. (1996). Intergenerational program effects on social responses of elderly adult day care members. *Educational Gerontology*, 22, 467–482.

Stanton, G. & Tench, P. (2003). Intergenerational storyline bringing the generations together in North Tyneside. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 1(1), 71–80.

Stremmel, A., Travis, S., Kelly-Harrison, P., & Hensley, A. D. (1994). The perceived benefits and problems associated with intergenerational exchanges in day care settings. *Gerontologist*, 34, 513–519.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Xaverius, P. K. & Matthews, R. M. (2004). Evaluating the impact of intergenerational activities on elders’ engagement and expressiveness levels in two settings. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 1(4), 53–70.

APPENDIX

MATRIX OF FINDINGS AND SOURCES FOR DATA TRIANGULATION

Themes and subthemes	Sources of data			
	Interviews with administrators	Interviews with staff	Participant (IG) evaluation forms	Parent surveys
Intended Goals				
Relational	✓	✓	✓	✓
Programmatic	✓	✓		
Actual benefits of the program				
Programmatic	✓	✓		
Relational	✓	✓	✓	✓
Costs or inputs				
Tangible	✓	✓	✓	
Intangible	✓	✓		✓
Challenges				
Logistics	✓	✓	✓	✓
Participant characteristics		✓	✓	
Stakeholder buy-in	✓			
Future goals				
Programmatic	✓	✓		✓
Logistics	✓	✓		✓
Continued stakeholder support	✓			