



MAKING THE CASE FOR INTERGENERATIONAL PROGRAMS



**generations
united**

Because we're stronger together®

INTRODUCTION

We are living longer than we have ever lived in the history of humankind. In 2018, there were approximately 52.4 million adults aged 65+. We can expect this figure to nearly double to 94.7 million by 2060. One study predicts that half of all children born in western societies today will celebrate their 100th birthday (Christensen et al., 2009). Older women outnumber men and the older adult population is becoming more diverse in terms of race, ethnicity, geography, sexual and gender identities, and faith (Administration for Community Living, 2020; Fredriksen Goldsen & de Vries, 2019). Half of the United States will be of people of color by 2042 (Generations United, 2013). Intergenerational programs can help unite diverse populations in terms of age, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender identity, and sexual orientation to promote a stronger sense of social cohesion and purpose.

While we are living longer, our society is experiencing profound challenges in education, health, work and retirement, family caregiving, civic engagement, and a sense of belonging. Health, economic, and social inequities are a reality for many individuals and families. Black, Indigenous, and people of color carry a heavier burden of disease, disability, and multimorbidity such as diabetes, major depression, and social isolation. Many have tied these inequities to systemic racism (Gee & Ford, 2011). Ageism and age discrimination affect the young and old (Marchiondo et al. 2016) and is prevalent nationally and globally.

Age discrimination in the workplace is estimated to cost approximately \$850 billion annually due to lost opportunities for companies to produce goods and services by older workers (AARP, 2020). Internalized ageism is linked with depression, higher risk for cognitive impairment, and it also costs approximately \$63 billion annually in health care expenditures (Levy et al., 2020). We need to reimagine and rebuild communities to ensure healthy development for our growing demographic diversity (Generations United, 2013). Living longer will require that we live healthier and smarter, in harmony with one another and with nature.

The causes and solutions to these issues are multidimensional and complex. Innovative ideas are needed to ensure equal opportunity to education, economic security, health and health care, social and community relations, as well as healthy neighborhoods and safe built environments (Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, 2020). The good news is that there are local and national programs that bring the experience, talents, skills, and passion of different populations together to address these critical issues. This resource is based on a comprehensive review of the literature on intergenerational programs and highlights evidence-based findings on how intergenerational programs benefit everyone. The goals are ambitious and the outcomes are inspiring. Intergenerational programs are charting a way to achieve a healthy, equitable, and harmonious society for all.

“Intergenerational programs are charting a way to achieve a healthy, equitable, and harmonious society for all.”

WHAT ARE INTERGENERATIONAL PROGRAMS AND PRACTICES?

Intergenerational programs intentionally unite the generations in ways that enrich participants' lives and help address vital social and community issues while building on the positive resources that young and old have to offer each other and to their communities. These programs bring people of different generations together for ongoing, mutually beneficial, planned activities, designed to achieve specified program goals, and promote greater understanding and respect between generations. Reciprocity, sustainability, intentionality, training, support, and viewing younger and older people as assets are hallmarks of successful programs.



FAST FACT

There are approximately 11 million older volunteers every year who contribute approximately 1.9 billion hours of service which is valued at approximately \$45.4 billion (AmeriCorps, 2020). And more than half (54%) of youth ages 13 to 22 volunteer (Youth Service America, 2019). It is clear that individuals want to contribute to society. Intergenerational programs are poised to meet this demand.

There are many types of intergenerational programs ranging from mentoring and community service to service learning and workforce development. The goals of these programs are just as varied, as shown by the chart on page 11. Some programs primarily focus on improving academic outcomes among younger generations with older volunteers as tutors, mentors, allies, and friends. Other programs primarily focus on improving social, health, and economic aspects for older adults with younger generations as partners. While other programs aim to promote healthier lifestyle behaviors for both generations simultaneously, thereby lowering health risks. The possibilities for intergenerational programs are endless.



FAST FACT

Orientation, planning, training, supervision, and support are all necessary for successful intergenerational programs and must be used to prepare young and old for the experience (Pstross, et al., 2017; McBride, 2011; Hirn, 2007; Jarrott & Smith, 2011).

Intergenerational programs are meaningful, important, and fun. And they need to be thoughtfully developed with theory and informed by evidence. A recent scoping review conducted by Jarrott et al. (2020) identified the following thirteen evidence-based practices to guide quality intergenerational work: incorporate mechanisms for friendship, select or set the environment, provide training to staff or participant group(s), foster empathy, promote cooperation, offer meaningful roles such as mentorship and/or decision making, be mindful of time and scheduling, structure activities for flexibility, ensure authority figures endorse intergenerational contact, use technology, train facilitators to promote interaction, offer something novel, and convey equal group status. Stipends are also effective at recruiting low-income older volunteers (McBride et al., 2011).

WHO BENEFITS FROM INTERGENERATIONAL PRACTICES? EVERYONE.

A growing body of research shows that every age group benefits when different generations come together for a common cause.



BABIES TO PRE-SCHOOL

- Children as young as 9 weeks to 13 months old demonstrate higher levels of interaction and cooperative play with an older adult (Jarrott & Smith, 2011), when compared to children not involved in intergenerational programs.
- Children in pre-school who are partnered with older volunteers show better socioemotional outcomes such as increased tolerance of others, increased empathy, less judgment, and greater social acceptance (Gilchrist, 2014; DeVore et al., 2016; Lux et al., 2020; George & Wagler, 2014).
- Studies also document improved vocabulary and language ability (Heydon, 2017; Detmer et al., 2020; Femia et al., 2008).



ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

- A large body of research has focused on impacts on elementary school children. This area of research is rigorous with randomized control studies and comparative evaluations.
- Students who are partnered with an older volunteer show enhanced learning, reading comprehension and improvement in writing abilities (Gilchrist, 2014; Lee et al., 2012; Gattis et al., 2010, Isaki & Harmon, 2015; Galbraith et al., 2015).
- Evidence also reveals improvements in task orientation (DuBois et al., 2011), short-term memory (Kasseropoulou et al., 2020), problem solving skills and accountability (Gilchrist, 2014; Galbraith et al., 2015; Biggs & Knox, 2014), as well as patience, sensitivity, compassion, respect, and empathy (Gilchrist, 2014; Heyman & Gutheil, 2008; Galbraith et al., 2015; DeVore et al., 2016; Biggs & Knox, 2014).
- Their mental health is also impacted with reduced anxiety and sadness, reduced stress, and improved mood changes (Gilchrist, 2014; Gualano et al., 2018; Marcia et al., 2004; Cohen-Mansfield & Jensen, 2017).
- When the program has a physical component, children have better awareness of healthier diets and nutrition, are more physically active, engage less with “screen time” (smart phones, gadgets, and TV) and show improvements with overall well-being (Gilchrist, 2014; Martins et al., 2019; Schroeder et al., 2017; Raposa et al., 2019).



MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS

- Students in middle school undergo rapid physical, socio-emotional, and moral development. When middle schoolers are partnered with an older adult, they show improvements in academic performance (DuBois et al., 2011; Cohen-Mansfield & Jensen, 2017), family dynamics (Gilchrist, 2014), improved peer relationships (Raposa et al., 2019, Cohen-Mansfield & Jensen, 2017), decreased depressive symptoms (Gilchrist, 2014; DuBois et al., 2011; Raposa et al., 2019), reduction in substance use (Raposa et al., 2019; DuBois et al., 2011; Cohen-Mansfield & Jensen, 2017) and healthier eating habits (DuBois et al., 2011).
- Children supported by a non-family caring older adult also gain relationship skills, such as reasoning, problem solving, accountability, conflict resolution, and decreased bullying and victimization (Gilchrist, 2014; Raposa et al., 2019; Cohen-Mansfield & Jensen, 2017; Biggs, 2014; DuBois et al., 2011).
- They also express clearer educational aspirations, occupational interests and goals (DuBois et al., 2011).



HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

- Teenagers gain significant cognitive, emotional, social, and physical benefits because of their involvement in intergenerational programs.
- Teenagers experience improved sense of self and identity (Kim & Lee, 2017), self-confidence (DuBois et al., 2011; Cohen-Mansfield & Jensen, 2017), and purpose in life (Barnard, 2014; Knight et al., 2017).
- They are more likely to feel empowered to make changes in their schools and neighborhoods (Ohmer, 2016).
- Because of the socio-emotional exchange with an older adult, teenagers experience improvements with their emotions and mental health (Kim & Lee, 2017; Knight et al., 2017) as well as their physical health (Gilchrist, 2014; DuBois et al., 2011; Schroeder et al., 2017).



YOUNG ADULTS & COLLEGE STUDENTS

- The transition from adolescence to adulthood is a time when individuals focus on themselves to develop knowledge, skills, and self-understanding. They find where they belong in the world in terms of work and their personal relationships.
- Emerging adults who are partnered with older volunteers report improved civic engagement, entrepreneurial capabilities, and occupational skills (Milbourn et al., 2020).
- They also express self-confidence, efficacy, and sense of self (Pstross et al., 2017; Santini et al., 2020; Milbourn et al., 2020; Breck et al., 2018).
- Some even report they gain skills and knowledge in the realms of geriatrics and gerontology (Martins et al., 2019) – the medical, psychological, and social aspects of aging.
- Students also learned about recycling and other ways to improve the environment (D'Abundo et al., 2011).



PARENTS & ADULT CHILDREN

- Parents of children and youth report benefits of bringing younger and older populations together as well.
- Adult children report they are less concerned about their aged parents and feel better about their own civic engagement activities (Morrow-Howell et al., 2008).
- Family members report that older volunteers brought resources, information, and new skills back to the family; and that they had better relationships and communication with them (Morrow-Howell et al., 2008).



OLDER ADULTS

- Older volunteers in intergenerational programs report a stronger sense of community, decrease in social isolation, improvements in quality of life, greater life satisfaction, and a stronger sense of purpose, self-worth, self-esteem and empowerment (Giradeau & Bailly, 2019; Gilchrist, 2014; Gualano et al., 2019; Galbraith et al., 2015; Belgrave, 2011; Martins et al., 2019; Mahoney et al., 2020; Parkinson & Turner, 2019; Santini et al., 2018; Lux et al., 2020; Carcavilla et al., 2020; Santini et al., 2020; Breck, 2018; Knight et al., 2017; Andreoletti & Howard, 2018; Zhong et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2020; Gruenewald et al., 2016; George, 2011; Macfarlane et al., 2019; June & Andreoletti, 2020).
- Research also shows that highly engaged volunteers, individuals who contribute more than 200 hours per year, experience improvements in cognitive functioning such as mental alertness, executive functioning, and even the structure of their brains show more volume and activity (Gilchrist, 2014; Gualano et al., 2019; Cichy & Smith, 2011; Martins et al., 2019; Zhong et al., 2020; Carlson et al., 2008; Sakurai et al., 2016; Seeman et al., 2020; Carlson et al., 2009; Carlson et al., 2015).
- There is a reduction of falls and frailty, an increase in strength, balance, and walking speed, and instrumental activities of daily living, that is, day-to-day tasks, such as preparing food, housekeeping, doing laundry. They report positive attitudes towards youth and feel they have more agency to address neighborhood problems (Giradeau & Bailly, 2019; Gilchrist, 2014; Gualano et al., 2019; DeVore et al., 2016; Belgrave, 2011; Martins et al., 2019; Barnard, 2014; Breck et al., 2018; Montepare, 2018; Lee et al., 2020; Ohmer, 2016).
- Importantly, older volunteers report less social isolation, more social support, sense of connectedness and community (Giradeau & Bailly, 2019; Gilchrist, 2014; Pstross et al., 2017; Martins et al., 2019; Parkinson & Turner, 2019; Knight et al., 2017; Atkins et al., 2019; Teater, 2016; Zhong et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2020; Nicholson & Shellman, 2013).
- Older volunteers learn new skills, leadership abilities and a sense of achievement (Giradeau & Bailly, 2019; Gilchrist, 2014; Pstross et al., 2017; Cichy & Smith, 2011; Ohmer, 2020; Santini et al., 2020; Leedahl et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2020; Serrano, 2018; Varma et al., 2015).
- Because of these improvements in knowledge and skills, volunteering can be a pathway to additional paid-work opportunities in later life (Gonzales & Nowell, 2017).



AGES 100+

- Programs involving centenarians will likely become more popular as life expectancy continues to rise. A program in Chicago brings centenarians together with kindergarten students to count to 100 together (Little Brothers, 2020). They kindle their curiosity by answering questions about growing up and growing older – passing wisdom from one generation to the next.
- “MessAGING with Love” involves a series of interviews conducted by high school students to gain the advice and wisdom of *Kupuna* (elders), most of whom are centenarians, who live within a 1-mile radius of Iolani School in Hawai’i (Youth Service America, 2017). Taylor Hamai was a high school student when she started the program and has continued to study aging and opportunities for intergenerational learning (AARP, 2014).
- When young students have meaningful connections with grandparents and older neighbors or volunteers, they are likely to remain interested in aging and gerontology as they approach college and work.

COMMON OUTCOMES

The outcomes discussed above are uniquely tied to developmental milestones from infancy onward and there are common effects observed. For example, intergenerational programs have led the way to reduce ageism and age discrimination among young and old alike (Burnes et al., 2019; Gonzales et al., 2010; Rubin et al., 2015). Participants report improvements in mental, physical, and cognitive health that are unique to each life stage but are nonetheless common outcomes across the ages. Participants also report a greater sense of belonging and connectedness with others of different ages.

SOCIAL JUSTICE, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION

A growing number of programs are focused on diversity, social justice, equity, and inclusion. People of color, as well as individuals from lower socioeconomic statuses are less likely to be asked to volunteer but when they are asked and engaged, research shows that they report greater psychological, cognitive, social and academic outcomes compared to their counterparts (McBride et al., 2011; Morrow-Howell et al., 2008). The Eisner Foundation has invested resources in the Los Angeles County to intergenerational programs that advance equity and justice through mentoring programs, literacy efforts, the performing arts, and medical volunteers (Eisner, 2020). Below are just a few examples of intergenerational programs focused diversity, social justice, equity, and inclusion that we found in the empirical literature. Some cultures may not use the language of “intergenerational programs,” given that multigenerational and intergenerational relations are normative to their customs, values, and traditions. More programs and research are needed in these areas of equity, systemic racism, and cultural identity.

PROGRAM EXAMPLES

- *Hope Meadows, a model for intentional intergenerational neighboring, provides support to families adopting children from foster care, most of whom are people of color, with older neighbors as mentors and socially constructed grandparents (Eheart, 2020; Hope Meadows, 2020).*
- *The Yukon-Koyukuk Elder Assisted Living Facility in Galena, Alaska, is intentionally designed to ensure older residents are connected with family, friends, and youth, and are able to share histories, traditions, and tribal culture (U.S. Department for Housing and Urban Development, n.d.). Having a strong sense of belonging and understanding of history and cultural ways of living is protective to health and coping in the face of adversity (Generations United & National Indian Child Welfare Association, 2020).*
- *Darrow and Belgrave (2012) document the positive outcomes of a music therapy program that brings students with intellectual disabilities and older adults with cognitive impairment together to sing music.*
- *An Intergenerational home sharing program aims to bolster economic security, health, and a sense of belonging between the older neighbors and graduate students with a focus on people of color, first generation students, and low-income older adults (Gonzales et al. 2019).*
- *The International Association for Indigenous Aging and the Michigan Public Health Institute aims to reduce childhood deaths in Native Communities by working with elder tribal participants, especially grandmothers, to conduct focused mentoring and education for young tribal mothers (International Association for Indigenous Aging, 2020).*

SPILL-OVER EFFECTS ON STAFF, CAREGIVERS, AND NEIGHBORHOODS

Administrators and staff report positive outcomes as well, such as improved mental health (Kamei et al., 2020), an increased sense of community (MacKenzie et al., 2011), and gaining a sense of energy and purpose during long and hard workdays (Heyman & Gutheil, 2008). Informal caregivers receive respite when a younger person cares for their loved one and they too report joy from the experience (Heyman & Gutheil, 2008; Guerrero, 2017). Family caregivers also report decreased social isolation (Heyman & Gutheil, 2008). Some studies have identified an increase in neighborhood trust, social cohesion and a sense of community (Ohmer, 2016; Whiteland, 2013; Murayama et al., 2019). Shared site intergenerational programs - settings where children, youth, and older adults participate in services and/or programs at the same time and at the same place - have shown many benefits for staff, families, and organizations (Jarrott & Bruno; Generations United & The Eisner Foundation, 2018). Shared sites include after school programs held at a senior center or child care in a long-term care setting. Multiple generations also come together to make physical improvements to the community such as walking trails, benches, urban parks, green spaces, clearer signage, reduced litter, and recycling options (Kaplan et al., 2020).

NEGATIVE OUTCOMES

Participants do report some negative effects but these tend to be small in number and can be prevented with organizational policies and practices. For example, approximately 6% of older volunteers who tutored elementary school children were disappointed with administration, distressed to see social conditions and felt unable to help, and some were stressed (Morrow-Howell, et al. 2008). Some volunteers also reported conflict of time and scheduling with family activities.

A small number of older volunteers reported contracting the flu from children and teachers before the COVID pandemic (Morrow-Howell, 2008). Many intergenerational programs were paused due to COVID-19 and several intergenerational programs pivoted surprisingly quickly and efficiently to online platforms (Galucia et al., 2020). Online platforms became especially helpful because it expanded access to older volunteers with mobility issues, health, family, or geographic constraints (Cravens & Ellis, 2014). Other programs that delivered food and medicine to homebound individuals developed policies and practices to mitigate infection by following The Centers for Disease and Control (CDC) guidelines to wash hands, wear masks, practice physical distancing, and stay home when feeling ill. Adopting online formats and CDC practices enabled some older volunteers to continue in a COVID context (Galucia et al., 2020; Gordon et al., 2020).

These negative effects should be proactively considered and thoughtfully addressed when implementing programs (e.g. health and safety protocols including required vaccinations for participation).

COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

Very few intergenerational programs have conducted a cost benefit analysis. One exception is Experience Corps (EC), a program model that aims to improve academic outcomes among at-risk children, while simultaneously improving the health conditions of older volunteers. A large and rigorous body of research has documented positive outcomes among older adults, children, teachers, and family (Carlson et al., 2015; Fried et al., 2013; Gattis et al., 2010; Hong & Morrow-Howell, 2010; Lee et al., 2010; Morrow-Howell et al., 2008). Experimental and quasi-experimental research has found that older members in EC experienced decreased frailty and falls; fewer depressive symptoms; enhanced memory, strength, balance, walking speed, cortical plasticity, and executive functioning; increased social and psychological engagement; and improved mobility and instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs) (Carlson et al., 2015; Fried et al., 2013; Hong & Morrow-Howell, 2010). A randomized field trial of elementary school children offers evidence that the intervention contributed to improvements in students' improved comprehension and reading skills (Gattis et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2010), both of which are key predictors to attending and completing college. Because children in the EC programs have not yet entered or completed high school or college, Frick et al. (2004) apply conservative assumptions to a simulated cost-effective analyses. Their conclusion: because of the gains in academic performance and health, EC is likely cost effective.

There is emerging evidence that shared site intergenerational programs are cost effective (Jarrott et al., 2008). Services that are concurrently provided to younger and older persons in a single facility, with the same personnel and under the same roof, can be more cost effective rather than having two separate buildings and two full personnel to deliver similar services (e.g., meals, social engagement, education).

RESOURCES

- [*Connecting Generations in Senior Housing: A Program Implementation Toolkit*](#)
- [*Tried and True: A Guide to Successful Intergenerational Activities at Shared Site Programs*](#)
- [*I Need You, You Need Me: The Young, the Old, and What We Can Achieve Together*](#)
- [*All in Together: Creating Spaces Where Young and Old Thrive*](#)
- [*The Intergenerational Activities Sourcebook*](#)



CONCLUSION

Intergenerational programs are meaningful, important, and fun - and they are booming across the U.S. and around the world. If you have participated in one or seen one in action, you will likely recall the high levels of energy, enthusiasm, and innovation. Evaluation data suggests they improve academic performance and various dimensions of health, and they bolster a strong sense of community and compassion. Research also shows that every age group is positively impacted by these types of programs. There are also benefits for administrators and staff members of these programs, family members of program participants, and other community residents. We hope you will use this resource to help make the case for intergenerational initiatives in your community. Together, we can help build a world that values and engages all generations.

TARGETED OUTCOMES BY INTERGENERATIONAL PROGRAMS

OUTCOMES	YOUNGER GENERATIONS	OLDER GENERATIONS
Academic Achievement		
Socio-emotional learning	•	
Reading or math comprehension	•	
Ability to self-regulate	•	
Student classroom behaviors	•	
High school graduation	•	
College attendance/completion	•	
Patient-centered health service delivery	•	
Prevention of Substance Use (alcohol, drugs, tobacco)	•	•
Physical Health		
Prevention/reduction of obesity	•	•
Increased physical activity	•	•
Chronic conditions (e.g., hypertension)		•
Prevention/reduction in falls		•
Cognitive Health		
Executive functioning	•	•
Memory	•	•
Verbal learning	•	•
Neuroplasticity		•
Psychological Health		
Self-esteem	•	•
Self-confidence	•	•
Locus of control		•
Social Isolation		•
Generativity		•
Anxiety	•	•
Reduced fear/anxiety with regard to aging	•	•
Life Satisfaction		•
Hopelessness		•
Depression		•
Social Wellbeing		
Civic Engagement	•	•
Attitudes: Openness towards diversity (age, race, disability)	•	•
Attitudes towards aging	•	•
Sense of community	•	•
Increased skills in empathy and communication	•	•
Increased social activities		•
Overall Health and Quality of Life		•
Housing Security	•	•
Nature (e.g., recycling, gardening)	•	•

REFERENCES

- AARP (2020). [The economic impact of age discrimination](#).
- AARP (2014). [Students study aging, promote intergenerational learning](#).
- Administration for Community Living (2020). [2019 Profile of Older Americans](#)
- AmeriCorps (2020). [Older adults \(age 65+\)](#).
- Andreoletti, C., & Howard, J. L. (2018). Bridging the generation gap: Intergenerational service-learning benefits young and old. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education*, 39(1), 46-60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701960.2016.1152266>
- Atkins, R., Deatricks, J. A., Gage, G. S., Earley, S., Earley, D., & Lipman, T. H. (2019). Partnerships to Evaluate the Social Impact of Dance for Health: A Qualitative Inquiry. *Journal of Community Health Nursing*, 36(3), 124-138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370016.2019.1630963>
- Barbosa, M. R., Campinho, A., & Silva, G. (2020). "Give and Receive": The Impact of an Intergenerational Program on Institutionalized Children and Older Adults. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2020.1742844>
- Barnard, D. (2014). Through our eyes: A pastoral care bridge linking the generations. *Journal of Religion, Spirituality & Aging*, 26(2-3), 122-135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15528030.2013.826161>
- Belgrave, M. (2012). Implementing Music Therapy-Based Intergenerational Programs in the Community. *International Journal of the Arts in Society*, 6(6). <https://doi.org/10.18848/1833-1866/CGP/v06i06/36109>
- Beynon, C., & Lang, J. (2018). The more we get together, the more we learn: Focus on intergenerational and collaborative learning through singing. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 16(1-2), 45-63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2018.1404405>
- Biggs, M. J. G., & Knox, K. S. (2014). Lessons learned from an intergenerational volunteer program: A case study of a shared-site model. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 12(1), 54-68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2014.869981>
- Breck, B. M., Dennis, C. B., & Leedah, S. N. (2018). Implementing reverse mentoring to address social isolation among older adults. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 61(5), 513-525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01634372.2018.1448030>
- Burnes, D., Sheppard, C., Henderson Jr, C. R., Wassel, M., Cope, R., Barber, C., & Pillemer, K. (2019). Interventions to reduce ageism against older adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*, 109(8), e1-e9. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2019.305123>
- Butts, D. M. (2014). Reflecting Back and Moving Forward: Shaping the Intergenerational Field from the Field. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 12(4), 444-445. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2014.958921>
- Canedo-Garcia, A., Garcia-Sanchez, J. N., & Pacheco-Sanz, D. I. (2017). A systematic review of the effectiveness of intergenerational programs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1882. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01882>
- Carcavilla, N., Meilán, J. J. G., Llorente, T. E., Martínez-Nicolás, I., & Tamayo-Mortera, O. (2020). The impact of international videoconferencing among older adults and secondary students. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education*, 41(3), 352-366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701960.2019.1651724>
- Carlson, M. C., Erickson, K. I., Kramer, A. F., Voss, M. W., Bolea, N., Mielke, M., ... & Fried, L. P. (2009). Evidence for neurocognitive plasticity in at-risk older adults: the Experience Corps program. *Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biomedical Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 64(12), 1275-1282. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geron/glp117>
- Carlson, M. C., Kuo, J. H., Chuang, Y. F., Varma, V. R., Harris, G., Albert, M. S., ... & Tan, E. J. (2015). Impact of the Baltimore Experience Corps Trial on cortical and hippocampal volumes. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, 11(11), 1340-1348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2014.12.005>
- Carlson, M. C., Saczynski, J. S., Rebok, G. W., Seeman, T., Glass, T. A., McGill, S., ... & Fried, L. P. (2008). Exploring the effects of an "everyday" activity program on executive function and memory in older adults: Experience Corps®. *The Gerontologist*, 48(6), 793-801. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/48.6.793>
- Carson, A. J., Kobayashi, K. M., & Kuehne, V. S. (2011). The Meadows School Project: Case study of a unique shared site intergenerational program. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 9(4), 405-417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2011.618369>
- Caspar, S., Davis, E., McNeill, D. M. J., & Kellett, P. (2019). Intergenerational Programs: Breaking Down Ageist Barriers and Improving Youth Experiences. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 53(2), 149-164. DOI:10.18666/TRJ-2019-V53-12-9126
- Children and adults reading interactively: The social benefits of an exploratory intergenerational program. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 36(2), 90-101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525740114529154>
- Chippendale, T., & Boltz, M. (2015). Living Legends: students' responses to an intergenerational life review writing program. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 63(4), 782-788. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.13236>
- Chorn Dunham, C., & Casadonte, D. (2009). Children's attitudes and classroom interaction in an intergenerational education program. *Educational Gerontology*, 35(5), 453-464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03601270802605473>
- Christensen, K., Doblhammer, G., Rau, R., & Vaupel, J. W. (2009). Ageing populations: the challenges ahead. *Lancet (London, England)*, 374(9696), 1196-1208. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(09\)61460-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61460-4)
- Cichy, K. E., & Smith, G. C. (2011). Closing the generation gap: Using discussion groups to benefit older adults and college students. In *Enhancing cognitive fitness in adults* (pp. 137-154). Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0636-6_8
- Clements-Cortés, A. (2019). Connecting Generations through Intergenerational Programs and Music. *The Canadian Music Educator*, 60(4), 31-33.

- Cohen-Mansfield, J., & Jensen, B. (2017). Intergenerational programs in schools: Prevalence and perceptions of impact. *Journal of Applied Gerontology, 36*(3), 254-276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464815570663>
- Cordier, R., Wilson, N. J., Stancliffe, R. J., MacCallum, J., Vaz, S., Buchanan, A., ... & Falkmer, T. S. (2016). Formal intergenerational mentoring at Australian Men's Sheds: a targeted survey about mentees, mentors, programmes and quality. *Health & Social Care in the Community, 24*(6), e131-e143. doi: 10.1111/hsc.12267
- Cravens, J., & Ellis, S. J. (2014). *The Last Virtual Volunteering Guidebook: Fully Integrating Online Service into Volunteer Involvement*. Energize.
- D'Abundo, M. L., Fugate-Whitlock, E. I., & Fiala, K. A. (2011). Recycling mentors: An intergenerational, service-learning program to promote recycling and environmental awareness. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice, 17*(4), 373-375. doi: 10.1097/PHH.0b013e3182159674
- Darrow, A. A., & Belgrave, M. (2013). Students with Disabilities in Intergenerational Programs. *General Music Today, 26*(2), 27-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1048371312464637>
- Detmer, M. R., Kern, P., Jacobi-Vessels, J., & King, K. M. (2020). Intergenerational Music Therapy: Effects on Literacy, Physical Functioning, Self-Worth, and Interactions. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships, 18*(2), 175-195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2019.1670318>
- DeVore, S., Winchell, B., & Rowe, J. M. (2016). Intergenerational programming for young children and older adults: An overview of needs, approaches, and outcomes in the United States. *Childhood Education, 92*(3), 216-225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2016.1180895>
- Dorgo, S., King, G. A., Bader, J. O., & Limon, J. S. (2013). Outcomes of a peer mentor implemented fitness program in older adults: A quasi-randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 50*(9), 1156-1165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2012.12.006>
- Dreibelbis, T. D., & George, D. R. (2017). An intergenerational teaching kitchen: Reimagining a senior center as a shared site for medical students and elders enrolled in a culinary medicine course. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships, 15*(2), 174-180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2017.1294438>
- DuBois, D. L., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J. E., Silverthorn, N., & Valentine, J. C. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 12*(2), 57-91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100611414806>
- Eheart, B. K. (2020). *Neighbors. The Power of the People Next Door*. Belong Press: Champaign, IL.
- Eisner Foundation (2020). [Beyond zero-sum choices: The promise of funding intergenerational equity solutions](https://www.eisnerfoundation.org/2020/05/07/beyond-zero-sum-choices-the-promise-of-funding-intergenerational-equity-solutions).
- Femia, E. E., Zarit, S. H., Blair, C., Jarrott, S. E., & Bruno, K. (2008). Intergenerational preschool experiences and the young child: Potential benefits to development. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 23*(2), 272-287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2007.05.001>
- Franzen, S., Morrel-Samuels, S., Reischl, T. M., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2009). Using process evaluation to strengthen intergenerational partnerships in the Youth Empowerment Solutions program. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community, 37*(4), 289-301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10852350903196290>
- Fredriksen Goldsen, K., & de Vries, B. (2019). Global Aging With Pride: International Perspectives on LGBT Aging. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development, 88*(4), 315-324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091415019837648>
- Frick, K. D., Carlson, M. C., Glass, T. A., McGill, S., Rebok, G. W., Simpson, C., & Fried, L. P. (2004). Modeled cost-effectiveness of the Experience Corps Baltimore based on a pilot randomized trial. *Journal of Urban Health, 81*(1), 106-117. Doi: 10.1093/jurban/jth097
- Fried, L. P., Carlson, M. C., McGill, S., Seeman, T., Xue, Q. L., Frick, K., Rebok, G. W. (2013). Experience Corps: A dual trial to promote the health of older adults and children's academic success. *Contemporary Clinical Trials, 36* (1), 1-13. DOI:10.1016/j.cct.2013.05.003
- Galbraith, B., Larkin, H., Moorhouse, A., & Oomen, T. (2015). Intergenerational programs for persons with dementia: A scoping review. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 58*(4), 357-378. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01634372.2015.1008166>
- Galucia, N., Morrow-Howell, N., Sun, P., Meyer, T. & Li, Y. (2020). *The Impact of COVID-19 on Villages: Results from a National Survey*. Working paper. St. Louis, MO: Washington University.
- Gattis, M. N., Morrow-Howell, N., McCrary, S., Lee, M., Jonsen-Reid, M., McCoy, H., ... & Invernizzi, M. (2010). Examining the effects of New York Experience Corps® Program on young readers. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 49*(4), 299-314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19388070903117948>
- Gee, G. C., & Ford, C. L. (2011). Structural racism and health inequities: Old Issues, New Directions. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, 8*(1), 115-132. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X11000130>
- Generations United (2013). [Out of many, one: Uniting the changing faces of america](https://www.generationsgroup.org/2013/05/out-of-many-one-uniting-the-changing-faces-of-america).
- Generations United and The Eisner Foundation (2018). [All in together: Creating places where young and old thrive](https://www.generationsgroup.org/2018/05/all-in-together-creating-places-where-young-and-old-thrive).
- Generations United and National Indian Child Welfare Association (2020). [American Indian & Alaska Native Grandfamilies: Helping children thrive through connection to family and cultural identity](https://www.generationsgroup.org/2020/05/american-indian-and-alaska-native-grandfamilies-helping-children-thrive-through-connection-to-family-and-cultural-identity).
- George, D. R. (2011). Intergenerational volunteering and quality of life: mixed methods evaluation of a randomized control trial involving persons with mild to moderate dementia. *Quality of Life Research, 20*(7), 987-995. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-010-9837-8>
- George, D. R., & Singer, M. E. (2011). Intergenerational volunteering and quality of life for persons with mild to moderate dementia: results from a 5-month intervention study in the United States. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 19*(4), 392-396.

- George, D. R., & Wagler, G. (2014). Social learning and innovation: developing two shared-site intergenerational reading programs in Hershey, Pennsylvania. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 12(1), 69-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2014.869106>
- George, D., Whitehouse, C., & Whitehouse, P. (2011). A model of intergenerativity: How the intergenerational school is bringing the generations together to foster collective wisdom and community health. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 9(4), 389-404. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2011.619922>
- Gilchrist, C. L. (2014). *The Impact of Intergenerational Programs: Evidence for Expansion* (Doctoral dissertation, Miami University).
- Giraudeau, C., & Bailly, N. (2019). Intergenerational programs: What can school-age children and older people expect from them? A systematic review. *European Journal of Ageing*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-018-00497-4>
- Gonçalves, M., Hatton-Yeo, A., & Farcas, D. (2016). Overcoming ageism through a new intergenerational learning paradigm: challenges and findings. *Quality in Ageing and Older Adults*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAOA-04-2015-0016>
- Gonzales, E., & Morrow-Howell, N. (2009). *Evaluation report of Vital Visionaries: Medical students and older adult outcomes* (CSD Research Report 09-24). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development
- Gonzales, E., Morrow-Howell, N., & Gilbert, P. (2010). Changing medical students' attitudes toward older adults. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education*, 31(3), 220-234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701960.2010.503128>
- Gonzales, E., & Nowell, W. B. (2017). Social Capital and Unretirement: Exploring the Bonding, Bridging, and Linking Aspects of Social Relationships. *Research on Aging*, 39(10), 1100-1117, DOI:10.1177/0164027516664569.
- Gonzales, E., Whetung, T., & Kruchten, R. & Butts, D. (2019). Theoretical Orientations to Intergenerational Home Sharing with Implications for Direct Social Work Practice. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 48, 179-188 (2020). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-019-00726-y>
- Gordon, S., Gonzales, E., & Hilton, J. (2021). Building the Capacity of Neighborhoods and the Resilience of Neighbors to Respond to COVID-19: The Neighbor to Neighbor Volunteer Corps. In: Tosone C. (eds) *Shared Trauma, Shared Resilience During a Pandemic. Essential Clinical Social Work Series*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-61442-3_22
- Gruenewald, T. L., Tanner, E. K., Fried, L. P., Carlson, M. C., Xue, Q. L., Parisi, J. M., ... & Seeman, T. E. (2016). The Baltimore experience corps trial: enhancing generativity via intergenerational activity engagement in later life. *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 71(4), 661-670. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbv005>
- Gualano, M. R., Voglino, G., Bert, F., Thomas, R., Camussi, E., & Siliquini, R. (2018). The impact of intergenerational programs on children and older adults: A review. *International Psychogeriatrics*, 30(4), 451-468. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S104161021700182X>
- Guerrero, L. R., Jimenez, P., & Tan, Z. (2017). TimeOut@ UCLA: An intergenerational respite care and workforce development program. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 15(3), 290-294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2017.1329599>
- Hall, L. C. (2019). Talk, Don't Run: Can an Intergenerational Program Relieve Teenage Pressure?. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 17(3), 404-409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2019.1618671>
- Heydon, R., McKee, L., & O'Neill, S. (2017). Singing our song: the affordances of singing in an intergenerational, multimodal literacy programme. *Literacy*, 52(2), 128-136. DOI: 10.1111/lit.12135
- Heyman, J. C., & Gutheil, I. A. (2008). "They touch our hearts": The experiences of shared site intergenerational program participants. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 6(4), 397-412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770802470726>
- Hirn, D. (2007). Children's Family Center. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 5(2), 119-125. https://doi.org/10.1300/J194v05n02_08
- Hong, S. I., & Morrow-Howell, N. (2010). Health outcomes of Experience Corps®: A high-commitment volunteer program. *Social Science & Medicine*, 71(2), 414-420. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.04.009>
- Hope Meadows (2020). [We are the village it takes!](#)
- Horan, K., & Perkinson, M. A. (2019). Reflections on the Dynamics of a Student-Organized Intergenerational Visiting Program to Promote Social Connectedness. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 17(3), 396-403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2019.1617613>
- International Association for Indigenous Aging (2020). [IA²](#).
- Isaki, E., & Harmon, M. T. (2015). Children and adults reading interactively: The social benefits of an exploratory intergenerational program. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 36(2), 90-101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525740114529154>
- Jarrott, S.E., Scrivano, R.M., Mendoza, N., & Park, C. (2020). Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices in Intergenerational Programming: A Scoping Review. *Innovation in Aging*, 4, 732 - 733.
- Jarrott, S. E. (2011). Where have we been and where are we going? Content analysis of evaluation research of intergenerational programs. *Journal of Intergenerational relationships*, 9(1), 37-52. DOI: 10.1080/15350770.2011.544594
- Jarrott, S. E., Schroeder, A., & Perkins, O. (2008). [Intergenerational shared sites: Saving dollars while making sense. An analysis comparing operational costs of intergenerational shared site facilities.](#)
- Jarrott, S. E., & Bruno, K. (2007). Shared site intergenerational programs: A case study. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 26(3), 239-257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464807300225>
- Jarrott, S. E., & Smith, C. L. (2011). The complement of research and theory in practice: Contact theory at work in nonfamilial intergenerational programs. *The Gerontologist*, 51(1), 112-121. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.nyu.edu/10.1093/geront/gnq058>

- June, A., & Andreoletti, C. (2020). Participation in intergenerational service-learning benefits older adults: A brief report. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education, 41*(2), 169-174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701960.2018.1457529>
- Kamei, T., Itoi, W., Kajii, F., Kawakami, C., Hasegawa, M., & Sugimoto, T. (2011). Six month outcomes of an innovative weekly intergenerational day program with older adults and school-aged children in a Japanese urban community. *Japan Journal of Nursing Science, 8*(1), 95-107. doi:10.1111/j.1742-7924.2010.00164.x
- Kamei, T., Meguro, S., Yamamoto, Y., & Kanamori, T. (2020). St. Luke's Intergenerational Day Program; Nagomi-no-kai (Harmonized Program) Program Profile. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships, 18*(1), 106-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2020.1709952>
- Kaplan, M., Thang, L. L., Sánchez, M., & Hoffman, J. (Eds.). (2020). *Intergenerational contact zones: Place-based strategies for promoting social inclusion and belonging*. DOI:10.4324/9780429199097
- Kasseropoulou, M., Koniari, G., Frosi, L., Papantoniou, G., Tsolaki, M., & Moraitou, D. (2020). Pilot intergenerational interaction program in elementary school: examining the effects on the cognitive skills of students attending the First Class of the Elementary School. *Scientific Annals-School of Psychology AUTH, 13*, 94-123. <https://doi.org/10.26262/sasp.v13i0.7743>
- Kim, J., & Lee, J. (2017). Intergenerational program for nursing home residents and adolescents in Korea. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing, 44*(1), 32-41. <https://doi.org/10.3928/00989134-20170908-03>
- Knight, T., Skouteris, H., Townsend, M., & Hooley, M. (2017). The act of giving: a pilot and feasibility study of the My Life Story programme designed to foster positive mental health and well-being in adolescents and older adults. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 22*(2), 165-178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2014.881297>
- Lee, K., Jarrott, S. E., & Juckett, L. A. (2020). Documented Outcomes for Older Adults in Intergenerational Programming: A Scoping Review. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships, 18*(2), 113-138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2019.1673276>
- Lee, M. M., Camp, C. J., & Malone, M. L. (2007). Effects of intergenerational Montessori-based activities programming on engagement of nursing home residents with dementia. *Clinical Interventions in Aging, 2*(3), 477.
- Lee, Y. S., Morrow-Howell, N., Jonson-Reid, M., & McCrary, S. (2012). The effect of the Experience Corps® program on student reading outcomes. *Education and Urban Society, 44*(1), 97-118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124510381262>
- Leedahl, S. N., Brasher, M. S., Estus, E., Breck, B. M., Dennis, C. B., & Clark, S. C. (2019). Implementing an interdisciplinary intergenerational program using the Cyber Seniors® reverse mentoring model within higher education. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education, 40*(1), 71-89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701960.2018.1428574>
- Levy, B. R., Slade, M. D., Chang, E. S., Kanno, S., & Wang, S. Y. (2020). Ageism amplifies cost and prevalence of health conditions. *The Gerontologist, 60*(1), 174-181. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gny131>
- Lin, Y. C., Dai, Y. T., Huang, L. H., Wang, S. C., & Huang, G. S. (2017). Creative approach for successful aging: A pilot study of an intergenerational health promotion program. *Geriatrics & Gerontology International, 17*(11), 1799-1807. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ggi.12963>
- Little Brothers (2020). [Intergenerational Programs](#).
- Lokon, E., Li, Y., & Parajuli, J. (2017). Using art in an intergenerational program to improve students' attitudes toward people with dementia. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education, 38*(4), 407-424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701960.2017.1281804>
- Low, L. F., Russell, F., McDonald, T., & Kauffman, A. (2015). Grandfriends, an intergenerational program for nursing-home residents and preschoolers: A randomized trial. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships, 13*(3), 227-240. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JGP.0b013e3181f17f20>
- Lux, C., Tarabochia, D., & Barben, E. (2020). Intergenerational Program Perceptions and Recommendations: Perspectives from Teachers, Children, Residents, and Staff. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships, 18*(2), 196-213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2019.1665609>
- Lynott, P. P., & Merola, P. R. (2007). Improving the attitudes of 4th graders toward older people through a multidimensional intergenerational program. *Educational Gerontology, 33*(1), 63-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03601270600864041>
- Macfarlane, J., Stephens, C., & Taylor, J. (2019). Intergenerational exchange and the possibilities of role substitution for older people. *Quality in Ageing and Older Adults, 20*(3), 98-109. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAOA-03-2019-0013>
- MacKenzie, S. L., Carson, A. J., & Kuehne, V. S. (2011). The meadows school project: A unique intergenerational "immersion" program. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships, 9*(2), 207-212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2011.568343>
- Mahoney, N., Wilson, N. J., Buchanan, A., Milbourn, B., Hoey, C., & Cordier, R. (2020). Older male mentors: Outcomes and perspectives of an intergenerational mentoring program for young adult males with intellectual disability. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia: Official Journal of Australian Association of Health Promotion Professionals, 31*(1), 16. DOI: 10.1002/hpja.250
- Marcia, S. M., Alicia, R. P., Parpura-Gill, A., & Cohen-Mansfield, J. (2004). Direct observations of children at risk for academic failure: Benefits of an intergenerational visiting program. *Educational Gerontology, 30*(8), 663-675. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03601270490483896>
- Marchiondo, L., Gonzales, E., & Ran, S. (2016). Development and Validation of the Workplace Age Discrimination Scale (WADS). *Journal of Business and Psychology, 31*, 493-513, DOI: 10.1007/s10869-015-9425-6.
- Martins, T., Midão, L., Martínez Veiga, S., Dequech, L., Busse, G., Bertram, M., ... & Costa, E. (2019). Intergenerational programs review: Study design and characteristics of intervention, outcomes, and effectiveness. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships, 17*(1), 93-109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2018.1500333>

- McBride, A. M., Gonzales, E., Morrow-Howell, N., & McCrary, S. (2011). Stipends in Volunteer Civic Service: Inclusion, Retention, and Volunteer Benefits. *Public Administration Review*, 71(6), 850-858. doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02419.x
- Milbourn, B., Mahoney, N., Trimboli, C., Hoey, C., Cordier, R., Buchanan, A., & Wilson, N. J. (2020). "Just one of the guys" An application of the Occupational Wellbeing framework to graduates of a Men's Shed Program for young unemployed adult males with intellectual disability. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 67(2), 121-130. DOI: 10.1111/1440-1630.12630
- Montepare, J. M., & Farah, K. S. (2018). Talk of Ages: Using intergenerational classroom modules to engage older and younger students across the curriculum. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education*, 39(3), 385-394. https://doi.org/10.1080/O2701960.2016.1269006
- Morrow-Howell, N., McCrary, S., Gonzales, E., McBride, A. M., Hong, S.I., & Blaine, W. (2008). *Experience Corps: Benefits of Volunteering*. (CSD Research Brief 08-23). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
- Mosor, E., Waldherr, K., Kjeklen, I., Omara, M., Ritschl, V., Pinter-Theiss, V., ... & Stamm, T. (2019). An intergenerational program based on psycho-motor activity promotes well-being and interaction between preschool children and older adults: results of a process and outcome evaluation study in Austria. *BMC Public Health*, 19(1), 254. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6572-0
- Murayama, Y., Murayama, H., Hasebe, M., Yamaguchi, J., & Fujiwara, Y. (2019). The impact of intergenerational programs on social capital in Japan: a randomized population-based cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health*, 19(1), 156. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6480-3
- Ng, K. Y. Y., Leung, G. Y. C., Tey, A. J. Y., Chung, J. Q., Lee, S. M., Soundararajan, A., ... & Wong, C. H. (2020). Bridging the intergenerational gap: the outcomes of a student-initiated, longitudinal, inter-professional, inter-generational home visit program. *BMC Medical Education*, 20, 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-020-02064-x
- Nicholson, N. R., & Shellman, J. (2013). Decreasing social isolation in older adults: effects of an empowerment intervention offered through the CARELINK program. *Research in Gerontological Nursing*, 6(2), 89-97. https://doi.org/10.3928/19404921-20130110-01
- Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (2020). [Healthy People 2030](#).
- Ohmer, M. L. (2016). Strategies for preventing youth violence: Facilitating collective efficacy among youth and adults. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*, 7(4), 681-705. doi: 10.1086/689407
- Ohmer, M. L. (2020). Youth-Adult Partnerships to Prevent Violence. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2020.1808555
- Parisi, J. M., Kuo, J., Rebok, G. W., Xue, Q. L., Fried, L. P., Gruenewald, T. L., ... & Carlson, M. C. (2015). Increases in lifestyle activities as a result of Experience Corps® participation. *Journal of Urban Health*, 92(1), 55-66. DOI: 10.1007/s11524-014-9918-z
- Park, J. H., Lee, K., & Dabelko-Schoeny, H. (2016). A comprehensive evaluation of a lifelong learning program: Program 60. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 84(1), 88-106. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091415016668352
- Parkinson, D., & Turner, J. (2019). Alleviating Social Isolation through Intergenerational Programming: DOROT's Summer Teen Internship Program. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 17(3), 388-395. https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2019.1617606
- Penick, J. M., Fallshore, M., & Spencer, A. M. (2014). Using intergenerational service learning to promote positive perceptions about older adults and community service in college students. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 12(1), 25-39. https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2014.870456
- Pstross, M., Corrigan, T., Knopf, R. C., Sung, H., Talmage, C. A., Conroy, C., & Fowley, C. (2017). The benefits of intergenerational learning in higher education: Lessons learned from two age friendly university programs. *Innovative Higher Education*, 42(2), 157-171. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-016-9371-x
- Raposa, E. B., Rhodes, J., Stams, G. J. J., Card, N., Burton, S., Schwartz, S., ... & Hussain, S. (2019). The effects of youth mentoring programs: A meta-analysis of outcome studies. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48(3), 423-443. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-00982-8
- Rebok, G. W., Parisi, J. M., Barron, J. S., Carlson, M. C., DiIorio, I., Frick, K. D., ... & Ramsey, C. M. (2019). Impact of Experience Corps® Participation on Children's Academic Achievement and School Behavior. *Prevention Science*, 20(4), 478-487. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-018-0972-8
- Rubin, S. E., Gendron, T. L., Wren, C. A., Ogbonna, K. C., Gonzales, E. G., & Peron, E. P. (2015). Challenging gerontophobia and ageism through a collaborative intergenerational art program. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 13(3), 241-254. https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2015.1058213
- Sakurai, R., Yasunaga, M., Murayama, Y., Ohba, H., Nonaka, K., Suzuki, H., ... & Rebok, G. W. (2016). Long-term effects of an intergenerational program on functional capacity in older adults: results from a seven-year follow-up of the REPRINTS study. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 64, 13-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2015.12.005
- Salari, S. M. (2002). Intergenerational partnerships in adult day centers: Importance of age-appropriate environments and behaviors. *The Gerontologist*, 42(3), 321-333. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/42.3.321
- Sánchez, M., García, J. M., Díaz, P., & Duaigües, M. (2011). Much more than accommodation in exchange for company: dimensions of solidarity in an intergenerational homeshare program in Spain. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 9(4), 374-388. https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2011.619410
- Santini, S., Baschiera, B., & Socci, M. (2020). Older adult entrepreneurs as mentors of young people neither in employment nor education and training (NEETs). Evidences from multi-country intergenerational learning program. *Educational Gerontology*, 46(3), 97-116. https://doi.org/10.1080/03601277.2020.1714142

- Santini, S., Tombolesi, V., Baschiera, B., & Lamura, G. (2018). Intergenerational programs involving adolescents, institutionalized elderly, and older volunteers: Results from a pilot research-action in Italy. *BioMed Research International*, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/4360305>
- Schroeder, K., Ratcliffe, S. J., Perez, A., Earley, D., Bowman, C., & Lipman, T. H. (2017). Dance for health: an intergenerational program to increase access to physical activity. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, 37, 29-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedn.2017.07.004>
- Seeman, T., Merkin, S. S., Goldwater, D., & Cole, S. W. (2020). Intergenerational mentoring, eudaimonic well-being and gene regulation in older adults: A pilot study. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 111, 104468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2019.104468>
- Serrano, I. (2018). *Evaluating the Social and Technological Benefits of an Intergenerational Program for Older Adults*. <https://doi.org/10.23860/thesis-serrano-itza-2018>
- Steinig, S., & Butts, D. (2009). Generations going green: Intergenerational programs connecting young and old to improve our environment. *Generations*, 33(4), 64-69.
- Strand, K. A., Francis, S. L., Margrett, J. A., Franke, W. D., & Peterson, M. J. (2014). Community-based exergaming program increases physical activity and perceived wellness in older adults. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity*, 22(3), 364-371. <https://doi.org/10.1123/JAPA.2012-0302>
- Teater, B. (2016). Intergenerational programs to promote active aging: The experiences and perspectives of older adults. *Activities, Adaptation & Aging*, 40(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01924788.2016.1127041>
- Thompson Jr, E. H., & Weaver, A. J. (2016). Making connections: The legacy of an intergenerational program. *The Gerontologist*, 56(5), 909-918. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnv064>
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (n.d.). [Tribal housing for elders to age in place in Alaska](#).
- Varma, V. R., Carlson, M. C., Parisi, J. M., Tanner, E. K., McGill, S., Fried, L. P., ... & Gruenewald, T. L. (2015). Experience Corps Baltimore: exploring the stressors and rewards of high-intensity civic engagement. *The Gerontologist*, 55(6), 1038-1049. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnu011>
- Vecchio, N., Comans, T., Harris, P., Graham, V., Cully, A., Harris, N., ... & Radford, K. (2020). Economic Evaluation of Intergenerational Programs: Suggested Measures and Design. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2020.1810194>
- Whiteland, S. R. (2013). Intergenerational visual art programs at shared sites: A step toward sustainability. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 11(4), 396-409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2013.839324>
- Wilson, N. J., Cordier, R., & Wilkes-Gillan, S. (2014). Men's Sheds and Mentoring Programs: Supporting Teenage Boys' Connection with School. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1440-1630.12090>
- Yamashita, T., Kinney, J. M., & Lokon, E. J. (2013). The impact of a gerontology course and a service-learning program on college students' attitudes toward people with dementia. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 32(2), 139-163. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464811405198>
- Youth Service America (2017). [Everyday Young Hero: Kacie Erith](#).
- Zhong, S., Lee, C., Foster, M., & Bian, J. (2020). Intergenerational Communities: A Systematic Literature Review of Intergenerational Interactions and Older Adults' Health-Related Outcomes. *Social Science & Medicine*, 113374. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113374>

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Generations United gratefully acknowledges RRF Foundation for Aging for its support of this document. Very special thank you to Dr. Ernest Gonzales, Associate Professor at New York University, Silver School of Social Work, and his colleagues Rachel Kruchten and Cliff Whetung for researching and writing this document. We also extend our gratitude to Dr. Matt Kaplan, Penn State University, Dr. Lori Marks, Link Generations, and Dr. Anita Rogers, Generations United Senior Fellow for their thoughtful review and providing invaluable feedback. Thank you also to Generations United staff Emily Patrick, Sheri Steinig, and Donna Butts for guiding this project. And a very special thank you to all the researchers and practitioners working to document and evaluate their great intergenerational work; we could not do this without you.

Photo Credits: Photos courtesy of Kingsley House (cover bottom right); Northland Foundation AGE to age (p. 2 top); National Indian Child Welfare Association (p. 3 top, p. 5 bottom), Champion Intergenerational Enrichment and Education Center (p. 3 bottom, p.5 top); Hebrew Senior Life/Rashi School (p. 4 top); Taylor Hamai/Iolani School (p. 4 bottom); Benevilla (p. 6); St. Ann Center for Intergenerational Care (p. 7). Any photos not credited are licensed stock photos.

Design & Layout: Six Half Dozen

This document was supported by a grant from RRF Foundation for Aging.



Because we're stronger together®

ABOUT GENERATIONS UNITED

The mission of Generations United is to improve the lives of children, youth and older adults through intergenerational collaboration, public policies and programs for the enduring benefit of all. For over three decades, Generations United has catalyzed cooperation and collaboration among generations, evoking the vibrancy, energy and sheer productivity that result when people of all ages come together. We believe that we can only be successful in the face of our complex future if age diversity is regarded as a national asset and fully leveraged. To learn more about Generations United, please visit www.gu.org.



ABOUT RRF FOUNDATION FOR AGING

During the last 42 years, RRF Foundation for Aging, formerly The Retirement Research Foundation, has awarded nearly 5,000 grants worth almost \$250 million—all dedicated to improving the quality of life for all of us as we age. RRF's grantmaking focuses on four priority areas—caregiving, economic security in later life, housing, and social and intergenerational connectedness. These issues are fundamental to allowing all of us to age where we want to and how we want to. RRF was one of the first private foundations to focus exclusively on aging issues, and continues to support a range of advocacy, direct service, research, training, and organizational capacity building efforts, both in the Chicago area and nationally. To learn more about RRF Foundation for Aging, please visit www.rrf.org.

© 2021, Generations United

Reprinting permissible provided "Generations United" is credited and no profits are made.

For further information, please contact:

Generations United
Phone: (202) 289-3979
Email: gu@gu.org
www.gu.org



**generations
united**

Because we're stronger together®