ABSTRACT. Shared site intergenerational care programs provide ongoing services simultaneously to old and young community members at a single facility, thereby, meeting the care needs of multiple generations. However, they face the challenge of sustainability common to all community-based programs. We employed the results management model to identify program elements that may enhance or inhibit sustainability of intergenerational programming at a shared site facility involving a child development lab school and adult day services program. The 4-step
results management approach is a strengths-based model that supports community capacity and achievement of community and program goals. The current paper describes the first step in the results management approach, mapping the terrain, which involves gathering evidence of community needs and strengths. Focus groups were conducted with eleven staff members from both programs after a 4-month intergenerational program. The focus groups targeted the needs and strengths related to intergenerational programming. Respondents identified strengths that enhanced staff members’ and clients’ capacity for collaboration. These included affective and developmental benefits for both generations and strong partnerships between staff members. Respondents also identified factors that limited collaboration, such as the need for greater authority support and cross-training opportunities. Findings from our study have been used by program administrators to continue using the results management approach to further build intergenerational community and expand the scope of evaluating intergenerational shared site programs. Other intergenerational programs may utilize the results management model to enhance intergenerational programming and increase program sustainability.
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INTRODUCTION

Advocates of intergenerational (IG) programming champion the opportunity for mutually beneficial interactions between older adults and young people (Kuehne, 1998; Newman, Ward, Smith, Wilson, & McCrea, 1997). Shared site IG care programs, which provide ongoing services to young and old people concurrently (Goyer, 2001), represent one type of IG program that receives growing attention. Such programs typically include a child care and nursing or adult day program that provide a range in level and type of opportunities for interactions between program participants. Shared site programs can help meet the needs of caregivers of both young and older family members as well as provide cost-effective services that benefit a broad array of community members (Chamberlain, Fetterman, & Maher, 1994; Hayden, 2003). Such programs afford unique benefits from linking the generations that
cannot be achieved in single generation settings (Deutchman, Bruno, & Jarrott, 2003).

**Intergenerational Program Research: Benefits and Challenges**

**Benefits.** Social benefits of IG contact linking preschoolers and older adult care-recipients have been identified by a range of researchers. For example, Short-DeGraff and Diamond (1996) found that positive social interactions increased among adult day services (ADS) clients during their interactions with children from the co-located preschool program. Administrators surveyed by Stremmel, Travis, Kelly-Harrison, and Hensley (1994) identified sociocultural benefits of IG contact for child and adult care clients, including shared relationships, unconditional love, and transmission of wisdom and history from the adults to the children. Camp and colleagues determined that, with training, adults with dementia could serve successfully as teachers of Montessori activities to young children (Camp et al., 1997). Similarly, Salari (2002) identified positive outcomes for ADS clients when they were given the opportunity to mentor and nurture child participants. Recent research (Hayes, 2003) also identified benefits of IG programming for children at a shared site program that included generational empathy and enhanced communicativeness.

Jarrott and Bruno’s observational research (2003) revealed two important outcomes associated with IG activities that linked young children and adults with dementia at a shared site facility. First, positive affect exhibited by adults who joined IG activities was greater during these activities than for comparison group members during non-IG programming. IG participant adults also demonstrated lower levels of passive or withdrawn behaviors during the IG activities (observational data was not collected on the child participants). A survey/interview evaluation of the same site (Jarrott & Bruno, 2001) indicated benefits for child and adult participants alike. Parents indicated that children gained the benefit of individualized attention and unconditional love from the elders as well. Parents also reported an increase in empathy for individuals of different ages and abilities. The older adult clients and their family caregivers indicated that the elderly clients felt needed and loved when with the children and that their affect and self-confidence improved as a result of spending time with the children. Evaluation of other IG programs linking similar client populations from non-shared site organizations revealed benefits similar to those described above (Newman & Ward, 1992; O’Rourke, 2000).
Challenges. While positive outcomes of IG programs predominate in the literature, negative outcomes have also occurred and challenges have arisen, even in research that identified benefits of IG contact. Early research by Seefeldt (1987) alerted practitioners to the potential negative outcomes of IG contact involving frail elders when she found that preschoolers involved with a nursing home visitation program possessed more negative attitudes towards older adults than children who did not visit the nursing home. More recently, Griff, Lambert, Dellman-Jenkins, and Fruit (1996) cautioned against the use of some IG activities with cognitively impaired elders because of the heightened potential for negative interactions between child and adult participants. Although Salari (2002) identified benefits of IG contact in certain circumstances, she also identified infantilization of elders through age inappropriate activities and environments as a major problem in poorly facilitated IG programs. Jarrott and Bruno’s (2001) survey research of IG stakeholders also revealed challenges as well as benefits of linking young and old client populations. For example, ADS clients described drawbacks, including noise and commotion associated with IG programming, while some parents indicated that their children were initially reluctant to join shared activities.

IG researchers have tapped program administrators for insight on issues that influence decisions to support IG contact. Stremmel and colleagues (1994) surveyed administrators of child day care and adult care programs regarding their attitudes towards IG contact and its perceived benefits and drawbacks. In addition to the benefits described above, respondents voiced potential drawbacks and challenges, including the divergent needs, interests, and energy levels of clients. Administrators also addressed the practical challenges of transportation, adequate space, and specialized training for staff. Finally, respondents voiced a concern that frail elders may be particularly vulnerable to the frequent illnesses experienced by young children and that the children may be fearful of the older adults. Equivocal findings affirm that IG programming should be conducted with care to enhance chances for success and limit the potential for negative outcomes. Challenges centered on generational differences, including different energy levels and divergent interests. Furthermore, service delivery issues emerged, such as the potential for cost savings and the need for specialized staff training to foster IG relationships.

Since IG programs often “belong” to one committed staff person, the sustainability of IG programs is a challenge even at shared site facilities (Deutchman et al., 2003; Hamilton, Brown, Alonzo, Glover,
Mersereau, & Wilson, 1999). Hamilton and colleagues determined that few IG programs, including shared and separate site programs, continue beyond two years (Hamilton et al., 1999). Deutchman and colleagues (2003) stated that IG activities often are considered optional and do not reflect a core value for the mutual benefits of IG interactions. Termination of contact between generations may result from staff turnover, lack of administrative support, or programming that is not generationally and developmentally appropriate for participants (Deutchman et al., 2003; Hayes, 2003; Salari, 2002). Facilitators often recognized the potential in linking younger and older generations but often fail to develop long-term goals and are surprised by the amount of work required by intergenerational programs (Hayes, 2003).

Researchers have linked unsustainable of varied community programs with a weak sense of community and the absence of values and long-term goals shared by community members (Mancini, Martin, Bowen, 2003). Bowen and colleagues (Bowen, Martin, & Mancini, 2001) define community capacity as the sense of shared responsibility that community members feel for one another as well as their ability to demonstrate collective competence in order to meet community members’ needs. Communities with high levels of community capacity recognize and capitalize on the strengths and assets of both the formal and informal network members in order to increase program effectiveness and efficiency. Stremmel and colleagues (1994) aptly suggested a need to clearly articulate an IG model of practice to foster benefits and limit drawbacks. The results management approach yields such a model for IG practitioners.

A Model for Enhanced Intergenerational Programming

Bowen and colleagues developed and tested the results management approach to achieve community outcomes, such as community capacity, using evidence based practices (Bowen, Martin, & Mancini, 2001; Bowen, Martin, Mancini, & Nelson, 2000; Orthner & Bowen, 2004; See Figure 1). Developed for family support programs on Air Force military bases, the results management model has proven effective (Bowen, Mancini, Martin, Ware, & Nelson, 2003) and has the potential to support sustainability of IG programs. The model contrasts with the commonly used activities management approach, in which a program revolves around activities with little assessment of the activities’ impact or relation to stakeholder needs and strengths. Results management incorporates four steps, including (1) evaluate community assets and
needs, (2) identify desired community (broad-based) results, (3) iden-
tify desired program outcomes, and (4) implement evidence/theory-
based activities/processes (Orthner & Bowen, 2004). When utilizing
this model in an IG context, program stakeholders identify the assets
and needs of program community members before identifying desired
community outcomes and then programmatic outcomes resulting di-
rectly from ensuing IG programming. Only after these steps are taken
should stakeholders propose programming activities. Furthermore,
only those activities that contribute directly to the community and/or
program goals should be implemented. Orthner and Bowen further pro-
posed that once activities are implemented, the cycle renews with a re-
evaluation to assess the program’s capacity for transformation and to
assess changes in program/community assets and needs.

To illustrate, a school may recognize the need for some students to
improve their reading ability, and they may identify a community asset
in the local Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP). Related to this
need and asset, stakeholders would then describe how the community
would look different if this identified need was met. Considering com-
munity outcomes first, high school dropout rates might be reduced if
students’ reading abilities improved. This outcome is broad and would
likely be affected by a multitude of factors, of which a reading interven-
tion could play a part. Turning next to programmatic outcomes, those
related directly to an intervention or program targeting the identified
need, stakeholders would expect participating children’s reading ability
to improve. Once these needs, assets, and outcomes are identified,
stakeholders can craft a program and activities that address these elements. Stakeholders might develop an IG tutoring program involving RSVP members and children in need of reading assistance. Periodic evaluation of the intervention over time would assess the program’s effectiveness in reaching programmatic and community outcomes through collaboration. Stakeholders would determine if the community needs and assets remain the same or have changed and would respond accordingly.

Program Description

A shared site ADS program and a child development laboratory school (CDLS) employed the results management approach in 2002. The ADS program served approximately 15 adults each day who required care and supervision due to physical and cognitive impairments. The CDLS consisted of six classrooms of children who ranged in age from eight weeks to five years. The approximately seventy children attended the program two to five days each week either in the morning or afternoon, while adult clients attended ADS two to five days each week for five to ten hours per day.

Levels of IG contact between the programs have fluctuated ever since they co-located 10 years ago. Issues of ownership and commitment related to IG contact that challenge other IG programs arose repeatedly. In 2002, the first author initiated a collaborative project to meet two identified needs: (1) to enhance the frequency and quality of IG contact between program clients and (2) to increase commitment to IG collaboration among program staff/students.

Research focus. The current paper represents the first step in the results management process, which entails describing the needs and assets of a program within the context of its mission, is referred to as mapping the terrain (Bowen et al., 2001). While both programs shared a mission to (1) support the well-being of the child or older adult clients, (2) to train professionals to work with the child or elderly client population, and (3) to conduct research involving the child or older adult clients, the philosophies informing the programs varied. For example, while the CDLS thrived on an emergent curriculum in which children’s interests drove daily programming, the ADS program embraced structure and routine to maintain the well-being and functional abilities of adult participants.

Administrators from the co-located programs began the results management process in order to assess conditions for linking program
participants, including benefits and challenges as they related to the programs’ missions. The evaluation occurred after the semester-long collaboration project in which staff from the two programs worked together to support increased IG contact between the child and older adult participants. Focus groups were conducted at the end of the project that targeted (1) staff/student participants’ experiences with IG programming at the site and (2) the degree to which linking older adult and child clients supported or detracted from the programs’ missions. By mapping the terrain, stakeholders have been able to utilize the findings to develop long-term community goals as well as short-term, programmatic goals, thereby enhancing the ADS/CDLS IG community and supporting an overarching goal of attaining high levels of community capacity.

METHOD

Participants

During spring 2002, each of six ADS Graduate Assistants (ADS GAs) worked with teacher(s) from each of the five CDLS classrooms and the school’s studio teacher in an effort to enhance the programs’ IG community through increased collaboration and IG contact. Eleven women and one male participated in the project. Eight respondents were white, one was Asian, and one was Native American. The participants ranged in age from 22 to 33 years of age and all but one of them were graduate students in the department of human development studying child development, adult development, or marriage and family therapy. Five of the participants were graduate assistants connected to the ADS program; these individuals spent ten hours a week involved in research and direct care experiences with the older adults enrolled in the program. Five of the remaining participants were head teachers in the lab school and spent 15-20 hours a week in the classroom with the children. The sixth participant from the lab school was a full-time staff person who worked with children from all of the classrooms. The respondents had a range of contact with their IG partners and the clients from their partner’s program. For example, some respondents visited the other program weekly to familiarize themselves with their partner program and clients as well as support IG activities. Other respondents did not have direct IG contact but served as supervisors of the program representatives who actually facilitated the IG programming.
PROCEDURE

During spring 2002, each ADS GA visited his/her CDLS partner weekly for one hour. The visits served two purposes: (1) to understand the interests and characteristics of children in the classroom and (2) to establish rapport with the teachers. Originally, CDLS teachers were expected to reciprocate with visits to the ADS but did not due to their responsibilities in the classroom.

ADS and CDLS partners collaborated to plan and facilitate a minimum of two IG projects during the semester that supported developmental and IG goals for the children and adults. The 32 activities that took place over a 9-week period among the five classroom partnerships included horticultural and craft activities, group storytelling, and informal visits where the adults helped to rock the infants to sleep.

Focus Groups

Two separate focus groups were conducted with the IG partners. Separate groups, one for ADS partners and one for CDLS partners, were conducted to promote a safe environment for sharing. Both focus groups were conducted by a neutral moderator affiliated with neither program. After explaining the focus group’s purpose, the moderator emphasized the confidential nature of the session and explained that participants need not answer every question. Each focus group lasted about one and one-half hours and was recorded for transcription. Numbers were assigned to group members to protect confidentiality and promote openness.

The moderator used an interview guide developed by the first author with questions that focused on participants’ experiences in the IG collaboration process. Questions addressed participants’ attitudes towards linking the two generations and their insights about how IG programming supported or detracted from their programs’ missions.

ANALYSIS

The authors coded the focus group transcripts using open coding procedures described by Strauss and Corbin (1990). Each investigator then collapsed their codes and created a list of themes and sub-themes using analytic induction. At that point the research team met to discuss these themes and used constant comparison to reach consensus in
collapsing the codes into salient, general categories. Each author identified quotes to illustrate each theme and enhance the transparency and subsequent credibility of the analysis. A final meeting enabled the investigators to insure consistency in coding, thereby enhancing the trustworthiness of the findings.

RESULTS

Through the process of analytic induction and constant comparison the research question was addressed identifying three main coding categories. The three main categories that emerged from the data were (1) benefits of IG collaboration, (2) challenges of IG collaboration, and (3) necessary elements for collaboration. These categories served the study’s purpose of helping to map the terrain for IG programs because they highlighted the strengths as well as the needs within the shared site intergenerational community.

Benefits of IG Collaboration

Benefits for the adults and children participating in the IG program were identified and discussed by participants in both focus group sessions. Additionally, the importance of achieving mutual benefit for the older adults and children was emphasized.

Benefits for the adults. Both focus groups discussed a variety of positive psychosocial outcomes for the older adults. Self-esteem of the older adults seemed to increase with the opportunity to mentor and nurture the young children. This finding supports Salari’s (2002) finding that IG programs are most beneficial when the older adults are given meaningful roles such as the opportunity to nurture and mentor the children. Research findings by Camp (1997) and Hayes (2003) also support the importance of fostering these interactions through the planning and facilitation of the IG activities. One respondent articulated this thought when she stated that

I think [IG activities] give [the adult clients] an opportunity for nurturance . . . it gives them an opportunity to be a mentor and take on the role of a teacher and somebody who can help another person . . . it helps them gain more roles in their daily activities and create a sense of autonomy and self-esteem.
Another respondent stated that building relationships with the children enhanced the older adults’ well-being:

It’s the best part of the adults’ day . . . literally! They thoroughly, thoroughly enjoy it. . . . Afterwards they would come up to one of us and said, “You know, tell whoever is in charge here that this is the best part of my day.”

Through observation and feedback from adult participants, focus group participants linked important benefits for the older adults to IG collaboration.

Benefits for the children. Several respondents highlighted social benefits of relationship building for the children. As one stated, “the children gained the ability to recognize and take advantage of opportunities to build relationships and learning to see people as individuals . . . I think it has been valuable in that sense.” Other focus group participants pointed to the opportunity that IG programming offered in terms of understanding the aging process. One specifically stated

It is really important for [the children] to see the aging process. I think it’s really important to see the older adults in wheelchairs or glasses . . . I think it is important for [the children] to be able to understand or become empathetic to what is going on.

The children and adults experienced both unique and mutual benefits. This finding supports previous research conducted by Hayes (2003) that found that children engaged in IG activities were able to gain greater empathy for older adults (Hayes, 2003). Findings reported in the Hayes study also discussed the children’s openness to the adults’ diversity, despite their awareness of it.

Mutual benefits. One ADS GA mentioned that IG interactions helped the children and adults achieve goals that were important to their growth and development. She stated, “A lot of the activities can foster goals for both groups, like gross and fine motor skills, and certain goals are developmentally appropriate for both populations.” One CDLS teacher related that mutual benefit is essential in successful IG programs. She stated, “I think the most important thing . . . is that whatever activities are going on . . . are mutually beneficial . . . if not, it is hard to continue that relationship.”
Finally, a CDLS teacher was impressed by IG Montessori activities conducted in a previous semester (Nester & Jarrott, 2001) because she saw the mutual benefit of some of the activities:

It was helping both the children and the adults by helping with the normal daily living activities. I think the intention was to do the activities with the children so the adults weren’t offended ’cause they felt they were helping the children do scooping and those types of things, but in the same time they were practicing some of their daily living skills.

Identification of generation-specific and mutual benefits for the adult and child participants reflected the synergy present in successful IG programs where everyone’s needs and abilities are supported.

**Challenges of IG Collaboration**

A variety of challenges arose from the IG collaboration. Sub-themes of logistics, authority support, the need for cross-training of program staff, and varied needs of program clients were present.

*Logistics.* One type of obstacle noted by the teachers and ADS GAs included logistical challenges that involved divergent programmatic structures and schedules. “The struggle was [the] different needs for the adults and the children. The adults needed... more structure and more activities with a set purpose and... our curriculum is more... about the choice of the children,” stated one CDLS teacher. These concerns further support findings reported by Stremmel and colleagues (1994), which highlighted the logistical differences between adult and child care programs such as the pace of scheduling and curricular practices.

*Authority support.* Authority support may come from tradition as well as from administrators and other key stakeholders (Pettigrew, 1998). The need for greater authority support emerged as a strong theme during the focus group sessions. The custom of IG programming has varied during the coexistence of the programs, as has support from program administrators. Although program and research directors of the ADS and CDLS sanctioned the collaboration project, communication of project goals was not clearly relayed to all of the focus group respondents. Consequently, one group of respondents was less informed of the program objectives and the mechanisms intended to achieve these objectives. Focus group participants identified limited authority support as a major reason for awkwardness, frustration, and miscommunication...
with their IG partnership. One student discussed her frustration with this situation

the first time [I visited my partner’s program] I really felt that . . . [my IG partner] didn’t know anything [about the collaboration project] . . . I think that having . . . someone in charge . . . tell them this is a project that we want to facilitate and that they know ahead of time that we are going to be there . . . would make more sense.

Therefore, the GAs and head teachers felt that informational support and encouragement from authority figures representing both programs would have optimized partnership effectiveness. Having the site supervisors acknowledge and support IG programming as a priority and an important aspect of the care provided to the children and adults was essential to building community and facilitating collaboration, but it was not always present.

*Cross-training.* The teachers and GAs specialized in populations at opposite ends of the age continuum. Consequently, the need for information about the other group emerged as a salient theme from the data. One respondent described a first-hand learning experience:

I’ve learned a lot about the different types of situations that [the older adults] are going through [at ADS]. It is just a misunderstanding that I didn’t realize if older adults have dementia that they wouldn’t remember day to day . . .

The need to understand the other program’s participants was also important outside of the IG interactions, such as when the children had questions about the adults’ limitations. One CDLS teacher mentioned

[The changes associated with dementia are] not something I necessarily understand, so it is hard to explain to [the children], and there is a difference in explaining to them, preparing them, and then stereotyping and that is a hard thing for us to say things to them because we don’t know if we are saying the right things.

Understanding the unique needs, abilities, and interests of the population one is working with is an important value in the realm of person-centered human services (Kitwood & Bredin, 1992). The CDLS teachers and ADS GAs felt that they lacked information about one another’s populations, which limited their comfort and ability to facilitate
activities and interactions between the two groups. For the teachers, this discomfort carried over to interactions with the children when they could not answer the children’s questions about aging and the older adults with confidence.

*Varying participant needs.* Although many IG activities address common developmental goals, including relationship building and exercising various motor skills, the varied needs of the participants challenged the IG facilitators. Oftentimes, children felt shy around new adults and needed time to acclimate. However, the older adults often felt a strong need to be well-received by the children and could become upset if the children did not want to sit with them or respond to their questions. Facilitators were often able to overcome these challenges. By selecting appropriate activities for IG contact and by providing thoughtful explanations and reassurance that eased tension and ameliorated hurt feelings, staff supported positive interactions between the older adult and child participants.

**Collaboration Among Facilitators**

Respondents identified collaboration as essential to successful IG programming. Both groups explained that effective collaboration involved sharing common goals, open and regular communication, comfort with the other’s clients and spaces, and mutual responsibility for initiating, planning, and facilitating contact.

*Communication.* One of the teachers discussed the fact that collaboration, characterized by open communication, was integral to increasing comfort and sustaining IG programming. She stated

> I think a key component of [a successful IG program] is collaboration between the head teachers and the grad students and faculty at ADS . . . I see it as something beneficial for us to come together so we can understand each other and something that will work for both of our intentions and both of our philosophies and goals.

Collaboration was enhanced in some circumstances. The ADS GAs who already had relationships with their CDLS partner felt greater comfort entering the classrooms and approaching teachers about collaborating on IG programming. Additionally, one ADS GA with specialized training in a recreational therapy received a high level of authority support for IG programming from the CDLS program director and the ADS activity director. She reported greater comfort in her IG collaboration as
she brought the children and adults together for shared therapeutic recreational activities. The challenges and benefits identified by focus group participants provide the program administrators and staff with valuable information to continue efforts to enhance their IG community. *Mapping the terrain* proved beneficial not only for IG participants but for the entire IG community.

**DISCUSSION**

Our paper represents the first step in the results management process of building community capacity (Mancini et al., 2003; Orthner & Bowen, 2004). Improving the sense of community at a shared site IG facility takes time, collaboration, and a common vision, elements necessary in any sustainable community program. By *mapping the terrain* of the two programs, we explored the programs’ capacity to employ IG collaboration as a means to build community and achieve program missions. Our findings demonstrate that the two programs are making progress towards a successful, sustainable IG community that meets the programs’ mission regarding supporting client well-being, yet work remains to be done. Collaboration and vision of a mutually beneficial IG community are reflected in participants’ responses. However, other comments indicate that competing demands and varied programmatic goals hamper development of community capacity.

Bowen and colleagues (2001) explicitly stated that allocation of staff time and other resources will be necessary in order to achieve optimal outcomes; in fact, the failure to provide the appropriate level of attention and resources can undermine the efforts and plans of committed others. Consequently, if commitment to the IG community is not embraced by all members, it may share the fate of many other IG programs that fizzle due to insufficient community support. In addition, agency resources may need to be allocated differently in order to assure links between agency and partnership activities and desired results. For example, the CDCLS administrators may need to coordinate higher levels of staffing or redistribute responsibilities so that teachers have time to visit the ADS and get to know its clients.

Our research represents an advance in the IG field. Previous research has typically focused solely on the experiences of the child or adult participants (Camp et al., 1997; Griff et al., 1996; Jarrott & Bruno, 2003). Our work expands beyond this unit of analysis to include the experiences of another key stakeholder in the IG community, the staff.
One might argue that an IG program cannot be deemed effective if benefits are only documented for one age group. Similarly, an IG program cannot be deemed effective without evaluating the experiences of program staff. If staff members feel that the costs of such programs, to the clients and/or themselves, outweigh the benefits, sustainability of the IG program is jeopardized. Work by Hayes (2003) and Stremmel and colleagues (1994), which included staff feedback, captured outcomes and mechanics of IG contact, including the need for staff communication and shared training. Their work did not, however, describe how staff felt about collaborating with IG partners, nor did they address the need for administrative support, which Pettigrew (1998) and Allport (1954) identified as crucial to successful intergroup contact.

IG programming typically takes staff out of their comfort zone as they come face to face with clients possessing characteristics (needs, ages, etc.) vastly different from the individuals for whom they traditionally care. Furthermore, staff members, who often experience a co-worker revolving door within their own programs, due to high turnover rates, are asked to collaborate with strangers from another program possessing different training and expertise. Without support from key stakeholders, including program clients, other staff, and administrators, it is thus no surprise that IG programs quickly fade. Our study revealed that sufficient support was often lacking from key stakeholders. When the organizational culture of collaborating programs is incongruent with the necessary vision and activities to build community capacity, success in achieving it will be compromised. If staff are given a voice and included in the process of building a community plan, they are more likely to become invested in the outcomes that can be expected from the IG programming and hence support the change process. Over the course of the IG collaboration project, staff and administrators of the two programs apparently sent mixed messages to focus group participants regarding support for the IG program. Some staff members easily fell into close working relationships with their counterparts. Other ADS/CDLS pairings required greater time and persistence to build a rapport. Competing demands and values challenged IG collaboration, which is consistent with the findings of IG and community researchers (Deutchman et al., 2003; Bowen et al., 2000). In fact Bowen and colleagues (2001) highlight the importance of forging partnerships between leaders, staff persons, and community members to build community capacity.

One key event, or non-event, was described by ADS GAs. While ADS GAs made repeated visits to their CDLS partners’ classrooms, not
a single CDLS teacher visited the ADS to become familiar with the space and clients prior to the IG activities. Due to job demands, the CDLS teachers do not have the same flexibility as ADS GAs to visit the partner program and work with their counterparts. In addition, program differences in commitment to building IG community could explain gaps in collaboration. The CDLS is renowned as a teacher training facility. Thus IG programming may be viewed by administrators and teachers as a detractor from a primary goal of teacher training and research (Deutchman et al., 2003).

Some focus group participants interpreted unfamiliarity of program staff with the IG collaboration project as indicative of lack of support from program administrators. It is difficult, however, to ascertain administrators’ values for IG programming without having interviewed them. Lack of familiarity with the project may represent lack of administrative support; yet, it could also be an artifact of miscommunication between ADS and CDLS administrators or between administrators and their staff members. Continued exploration of stakeholders’ values for IG programming and ongoing research to explore the processes involved with IG contact will further shed light on the potential for building community at co-located IG programs. In a follow-up project, interviews conducted with program administrators regarding their attitudes towards continued IG collaboration revealed increasing support for collaboration, yet practical and philosophical questions remain (Gigliotti & Jarrott, 2005). Allocating adequate resources, including time and training efforts, was identified as a major theme challenging sustainability of the IG program (Gigliotti & Jarrott, 2005).

Given the challenges identified by focus group participants, one might conclude that the described shared site IG program is doomed for obscurity. Rome, however, was not built in a day. Focus group participants receive support for IG programming from the clients, children demonstrate acceptance of impaired elderly, and the older adults can provide a nurturing environment for the children. Positive experiences related by participants fuel future IG interactions and contribute to the program’s strength. Challenges in linking members of the two groups can be managed through careful planning, familiarity with involved clients, and staff communication. Another strength of our study is the use of a framework that guides stakeholders towards achieving desired outcomes using evidence-based practices. The next step in the results management approach is to identify desired long- and short-term community outcomes and theory and evidence-based means for achieving these goals. More time and effort are needed, but
both groups have taken significant steps forward in strengthening their IG community.

Community development efforts to support long- and short-term goals continue at the ADS/CDLS community. Resultant efforts include bi-weekly study group meetings that enhance communication between administrators and program staff. Additionally, administrators are currently implementing an IG community development program that addresses key points identified in the focus group, such as shared training, increased levels of collaboration, and greater authority support. Multiple evaluation methods have been employed, including surveys, interviews, and qualitative journaling to determine program stakeholders’ values of IG contact and the impact of IG community building efforts (Gigliotti et al., 2003). Frequent opportunities for collaboration, regular cross-training sessions, and ongoing communication will support efforts to build and sustain community between this and other shared site IG communities.

Therefore, this study enabled us to map the terrain and become aware of the challenges facing individuals working to achieve high levels of community capacity. Identifying the “ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving” that comprised the organizational culture of the VT IG community was an essential step inherent in the process of mapping the terrain (Bowen et al., 2001, p. 74). According to Bowen and colleagues (2001), there must be an awareness of the institutional, situational, and personality factors that challenge key stakeholders to develop a commitment to partnership and ultimately make concessions to identify a common ground that benefits the community as a whole.
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