



Co-funded by
the European Union

Collaborative Evaluation Framework: Social Impact Evaluation Indicators in Intergenerational Communities

Intergenerational communities are environments in which people of different ages live together, interact and actively collaborate. In the context of the CIVIS project described here, each team implements practices aimed at fostering intergenerational communication, combating ageism and improving the quality of life of younger and older people. To determine whether these initiatives achieve their mission, it is essential to define evaluation dimensions and corresponding social impact indicators. The following sections explain the main dimensions of an intergenerational community and propose both qualitative and quantitative indicators at the individual, institutional and community levels to measure progress in intergenerational understanding, the reduction of age-based stereotypes and improvements in well-being.

Dimensions of Intergenerational Communities

Before selecting indicators, we need to clarify the dimensions that define a genuinely intergenerational community. In previous sections we linked these dimensions to the process of individualization in contemporary societies; here we examine them in greater depth. We have drawn mainly on reports by the World Health Organization and organizations such as Generations United.

1. Social connection and intergenerational cohesion

This refers to the quality of relationships between people from different generations and to the sense of mutual belonging within the community. Historically, concern about the 'generation gap' emerged in response to growing negative stereotypes about older people and increasing social distance between age groups, which threatened social harmony and cohesion (Sánchez, 2009; Sánchez et al., 2010). A central objective of intergenerational practices is therefore to rebuild the social fabric by bringing younger, adult and older people together in meaningful activities. A strong intergenerational community displays affective ties across generations (friendship, trust and mutual support) and joint participation in local social networks. For example, in projects in which different generations collaborate (students, their younger siblings, their grandparents, etc.), participants often feel valued, empowered and socially engaged after the experience (Sánchez, 2009). This dimension also encompasses intergenerational solidarity, understood as the willingness of age cohorts to help and understand one another, which is essential to a cohesive society.

2. Perceptions and stereotypes

This dimension focuses on the attitudes, beliefs and stereotypes that different generations hold about one another. Ageism, that is, discrimination based on age, is a cultural problem affecting both younger and older people. The World Health Organization defines it as age-based stereotypes and prejudices that divide people and undermine intergenerational solidarity (Observatorio de Chile, 2021). Thus, assumptions such as ‘all teenagers are immature’ or ‘older people cannot learn new things’ are ageist ideas that damage relationships. Combating these prejudices is crucial because ageism has negative effects on health, self-esteem and older people’s quality of life. In this regard, it is estimated that as many as 6.3 million cases of depression worldwide are attributable to age discrimination (WHO, 2021). Fortunately, meaningful contact between generations can challenge stereotypes: intergenerational activities are recognized as an effective strategy for reducing ageist prejudice and improving empathy (WHO, 2021). In an active intergenerational community, mutual perceptions evolve towards respect and understanding. Younger and older people come to value one another as individuals capable of making substantive contributions, rather than marginalizing each other on the basis of age. Several studies show that, through these programmes, young people become more aware of ageing and improve their attitudes towards older people (Sánchez, 2009), while older people revise preconceived ideas about youth. In short, this cultural dimension measures the extent to which ageism is reduced and a more positive and realistic image of each stage of life is generated.

3. Civic participation and solidarity

The third dimension concerns the joint engagement of generations in civic and community life. It involves assessing whether the community draws on the potential of all age groups in addressing public issues, volunteering, leadership and decision-making. An intergenerational community seeks to enable younger, adult and older people to work side by side on local projects—from organizing cultural events to improving the neighbourhood or influencing policy—thereby strengthening civic solidarity. This multigenerational approach can be decisive. Some initiatives have achieved positive community changes (greater safety, healthier environments and better recreational spaces) by mobilizing different generations around shared causes (Sánchez, 2009; Sánchez et al., 2010). For example, some programmes bring participants of different ages together to preserve local history, carry out community service or influence municipal decisions (Sánchez, 2009). These efforts not only benefit neighbourhoods by helping to solve specific problems, but also teach

younger and older people that they have much to contribute to society, reinforcing their sense of active citizenship (Sánchez, 2009). In this dimension we evaluate indicators of intergenerational participation: Does volunteering or the number of joint community initiatives increase? Do social networks and participation in neighbourhood organizations expand across all age groups? A desirable outcome is to see more community leaders of all ages working together and a stronger presence of young and older people's perspectives in decision-making spaces (Generations United, 2012). In short, this dimension measures intergenerational solidarity as civic capital: the community's capacity to come together by drawing on the social and emotional energy of each generation in pursuit of the common good.

4. Well-being and quality of life

A fundamental motivation for these programmes is to improve quality of life and well-being among both older and younger people (and their families). Meaningful intergenerational interaction can affect multiple aspects of individual well-being: emotional, mental, physical and social. For many older people living alone or in residential care, for example, spending time with students or children can break isolation, improve mood and restore a degree of vitality. At the same time, younger people gain affection, advice and improved social skills through relationships with older adults. Some studies have also identified specific health benefits. Older participants in intergenerational programmes showed improvements in memory, greater physical mobility and increased perceived social connectedness (Sánchez, 2009), all indicators associated with more active and healthy ageing. Children and adolescents involved in such programmes have, in turn, improved their social skills, school attendance and even academic performance thanks to support from older people (Sánchez, 2009). At the community level, an intergenerational community tends to be more welcoming to people of all ages, meaning that its environments, services and social support contribute to the well-being of every generation. This dimension therefore assesses how the project affects quality of life: less loneliness and greater perceived social support among older people, improved mental health, and increased self-esteem and life satisfaction across all groups involved. It also includes objective aspects (for example, older people remaining active or at-risk young people receiving support) and subjective ones (feeling happy, useful and part of a community). Ultimately, we seek signs that interaction between generations improves people's overall well-being and creates healthier communities.

5. Institutional sustainability and structural collaboration

Finally, an intergenerational community transforms not only individuals but also the institutions and structures that sustain it. This dimension examines changes in organizations (schools, universities, local authorities, residential homes and NGOs) and in the policies or resources devoted to fostering intergenerationality over the long term. Robust social impact requires generational connections to go beyond one-off events and become embedded in institutional culture. In the CIVIS project, for example, the university, older people's homes, NGOs and local educational centres are forging partnerships. Evaluating this dimension means examining whether these collaborations become consolidated: Have the university and the residential home signed lasting agreements? Is the programme repeated with future cohorts of students? Sustainability indicators include the creation of new spaces or permanent programmes for intergenerational activities (such as a university course aimed at people over 55 that continues each year, or an intergenerational community centre in the neighbourhood). It also encompasses influence on public policy—for example, a municipality developing an 'all-ages-friendly city' strategy, or other institutions adopting similar practices after seeing the results. One sign of progress is that more organizations in the community begin to use intergenerational approaches in their projects (Generations United, 2012). It is also desirable to increase the representation of all ages in decision-making bodies. If, for example, a neighbourhood council or advisory committee now includes younger and older people who previously had no voice, this could be considered a positive structural change (Generations United, 2012). In short, this dimension measures institutional impact and the community's capacity to sustain and expand intergenerational initiatives over time through supportive policies, resources and partnerships.

Evaluation Framework: Indicators for Each Dimension

Once the dimensions have been clarified, we can propose specific indicators to measure the social impact of the project's practices. Since change occurs at different levels, and following WHO recommendations, we structure the indicators into three categories: individual, institutional and social/community. At each level, both quantitative indicators (measurable numerically) and qualitative indicators (perceptions, testimonies and observations) are suggested, with the aim of providing a practical and accessible approach. These are observable signs of change that will allow us to assess the extent to which intergenerational activities are achieving their objectives in terms of intergenerational understanding, reduced ageism and improved quality of life.

Individual-Level Indicators (Participants)

These indicators explore how each person involved—whether young, adult or older—changes as a result of intergenerational interaction. They focus on changes in attitudes, skills, behaviours and personal well-being. Examples of individual indicators include the following:

Personal social relationships. Number and quality of new intergenerational friendships formed per participant. For example, how many older participants report having made at least one close young friend (and vice versa) after the programme, or how many visits/calls between cross-age 'pairs' continue over time. Qualitatively, testimonies can be collected about the support or emotional connection developed ('I now have a 20-year-old friend whom I talk to every week...'). This indicator reflects the breaking down of loneliness and the creation of mutual support networks.

Attitudes and stereotypes (individual ageism). Changes in perceptions of the other generation measured through surveys or psychological scales before and after the intervention. Examples include items assessing young people's attitudes towards older people, and vice versa ('Do you see the other age group as competent and receptive?'). One indicator could be a score on an ageism scale showing reduced prejudice after the intervention. Direct questions may also be used: 'How comfortable do you feel collaborating with someone from another generation?' or 'Do you think people of age X contribute valuable ideas?', examining change over time. Qualitatively, participants' comments may reveal a reduction in stereotypes (e.g. 'I thought teenagers did not listen, but I was surprised by how respectful they were'). For example, more positive attitudes towards old age have been observed among young participants after an intergenerational programme (Sánchez, 2009), indicating fewer stereotypes; at the same time, older participants report feeling more connected to and understood by younger generations (Sánchez, 2009).

Knowledge and learning. Acquisition of new skills or knowledge through intergenerational exchange. Indicators might include the 'percentage of older participants who learn the basic use of a technological device taught by young people' or the 'percentage of young people who improve their knowledge of local history or traditions transmitted by older people'. This indicator demonstrates mutual learning (for example, sports students teaching gentle exercises to grandparents while grandparents teach them recipes or traditional songs from their places of origin). It can be assessed through short knowledge tests or self-assessments of competence before and after the activity ('I now know how to do X, which I did not know before').

Empathy and mutual understanding. The level of empathy towards the other generation achieved by the individual. This can be measured using validated questionnaires that assess 'intergenerational intelligence' or the ability to put oneself in another person's position (for example, agreement with statements such as 'I better understand the challenges faced by someone of my partner's age'). An increase in this empathy, evidenced through interviews or group dynamics, would indicate greater understanding of the experiences and perspectives of the other age group. A young person might say, for example, 'I now understand what grandparents feel when they lose autonomy', while an older person might say, 'I have learned how young people today see the future'.

Emotional and social well-being. Indicators of mental health and personal satisfaction associated with participation. These might include, for example, self-reported levels of loneliness among older people (using loneliness scales before and after), which we would expect to decrease if the intervention were successful. Other indicators include self-esteem and sense of purpose, assessed through questions such as 'I feel that my life has more meaning after taking part', or by measuring depressive symptoms. Where activities involve physical or cognitive components, individual improvements may also be measured (a mobility test for older people before and after, or weekly physical activity levels). Among young people, prosocial attitudes could be measured (are they more willing to help older people outside the programme?) as well as perceived social support ('I now have older mentors I can rely on'). A desirable outcome would be for participants of all ages to report an improved quality of life: happier, less isolated and more active. In practice, this would reflect the programme's contribution to active ageing and to a more socially connected younger generation.

Empowerment and self-efficacy. Changes in personal confidence and capacity for action. Examples include how many older participants feel able to continue learning new things after a workshop with students (indicating empowerment to move beyond their comfort zone), or how many young people feel that they can become an important point of reference in an older person's life after volunteering. Concrete indicators might include scores on self-efficacy scales before and after the intervention, or questions such as 'Do you now feel more capable of interacting or working with people of a different age?'. An increase would suggest that the project changes not only perceptions of others but also participants' perceptions of themselves as agents of social change.

In summary, at the individual level we seek evidence of positive personal transformation, such as new friendships, reduced prejudice, acquisition of new skills and improved well-

being. Each indicator provides one piece of the puzzle in determining whether the intergenerational intervention is changing lives at the micro level.

Institutional or Organizational-Level Indicators

This level analyses changes in the organizations and institutions involved, as well as the creation of new structures supporting intergenerational relations. Here we refer to schools, universities, residential homes, NGOs, local governments and similar bodies, and to how they adjust their practices, policies or collaborations as a result of the project. Possible indicators include the following:

Inter-institutional collaboration. Evidence of sustained partnerships between entities from different sectors around intergenerational goals. Examples include the number of agreements signed or collaboration arrangements established between a university and an older people's home, between a local authority and a youth NGO, and so on. A simple quantitative indicator is the 'number of local organizations actively participating in the project' (which we would expect to increase over time). Qualitatively, we could document the diversity of partners involved (educational centres, social services, local businesses) and how they share resources. The emergence of new partnerships is a sign that the community is organizing around intergenerationality; previous experiences show that these approaches generate new partnerships between organizations and institutions that had not previously collaborated (Generations United, 2012).

Inclusive institutional policies and practices. This concerns changes in rules, programmes or curricula within institutions as a result of the project. For example, a university might formally incorporate an intergenerational module into student education (such as the University of Salzburg's 'Learning with All Ages' course), or a residential home might establish an ongoing youth volunteering programme. Concrete indicators might include: 'Existence of an annual budget allocated to intergenerational activities in institution X'; 'Creation of a department or coordinator role for intergenerational projects'; or physical adaptations (for example, a school regularly opening its doors to older people for joint activities, or a community centre installing furniture suitable for all ages). Another example would be the emergence of a new municipal policy—such as an active ageing plan that includes intergenerational actions—which would constitute an indicator of institutional impact at city level.

Participation of multiple generations in governance. Presence of younger and older people in leadership or decision-making roles within organizations. For example, we could measure

whether representatives of different generations were included in advisory committees, governing boards or working groups of participating entities after the project. One indicator might be the ‘number of people over 60 and young people under 30 included in institutional councils/working groups’, compared with the previous situation. An example is the Communities for All Ages initiative, which highlighted greater representation of younger and older adults in local initiatives after an intergenerational approach was introduced (Generations United, 2012). This demonstrates institutional change towards inclusion. It is also possible to monitor whether institutions adopt more inclusive language and approaches in their communications—for example, avoiding age stereotypes in brochures or promoting images of intergenerational coexistence.

Programme continuity and replication. A critical indicator of institutional sustainability is whether activities continue once the project’s pilot or funded phase has ended. We might measure, for example, the ‘number of programme iterations carried out annually’ (are the dialogue activities repeated each year with new groups?) or the ‘existence of plans to extend the activity to other sites/neighbourhoods’. If a school successfully developed an intergenerational project, did it incorporate it into its regular activities each academic year? Replication in other institutions also matters: another faculty deciding to implement a similar programme after seeing the results would indicate a multiplier effect. Cases of replication or geographical expansion could therefore be documented as a qualitative indicator of broader institutional impact.

Resources mobilized and capacity building. The amount of resources—human, financial and training-related—that institutions devote to fostering intergenerationality. Examples include the number of staff trained in intergenerational methodologies (training workshops for teachers, carers or facilitators on how to work with mixed-age groups), or the ‘amount of funding obtained or reallocated for these purposes’ (if the project secures additional funding from authorities or donors, this demonstrates institutional interest). Another indicator could be the creation of institutional guides or protocols (toolkits) for evaluating intergenerational activities—such as the Intergenerational Practice Evaluation Tool developed by researchers and adopted by several organizations (Generations United, 2022), or indeed this guide itself—which would signal professionalization in evaluation and continuous improvement.

In summary, at the institutional level we assess whether organizations evolve as a result of the project: whether they collaborate more, adopt practices respectful of all ages, and devote sustained effort to maintaining intergenerational exchange. Success would be reflected in institutions that are more open and inclusive of participation by all generations, and in a local

organizational fabric committed to this approach—which in turn reinforces and multiplies individual and community impacts.

Community or Social-Level Indicators

This level encompasses broader changes in the local community—and, over the long term, potentially in society—in terms of collective culture, social cohesion and the environment. These impacts are diffuse and difficult to measure, but fundamental, because they would indicate that the community as a whole is becoming more age-inclusive and that generational divides are narrowing in everyday life. Community indicators include the following:

Social cohesion and inclusion. The degree to which the community generally displays unity across generations. One indicator could be surveys of the social climate or neighbourhood coexistence: ‘percentage of residents (of different ages) who feel that people of all ages are respected and live well together in their community’. An increase would indicate greater cohesion. Community events can also be observed. For example, we could count the number of public activities involving a mix of ages (neighbourhood festivals with games for children and spaces for older people, community days with younger and older volunteers working together). If the project is followed by an increase in this type of spontaneous intergenerational event, that would be a positive indicator. The aforementioned Communities for All Ages initiative recorded greater connection between people of different ages, ethnicities and social classes in participating neighbourhoods (Generations United, 2012), indicating broader social cohesion achieved through its approach.

Cultural change and reduction of ageism in the wider community. This involves identifying indicators that reveal whether age-based prejudice is decreasing in the local community. It can be measured indirectly, for example by examining whether ageist or discriminatory language becomes less frequent in local media, schools or everyday conversations (difficult to quantify, although focus groups or community interviews can identify perceptions). A more concrete indicator might be the ‘number of reported incidents of age discrimination in community settings’ (where such records exist, for example in health centres or local services, trends could be monitored). Another approach is to survey the general population about attitudes towards particular age groups after intergenerational campaigns in the area. This would show whether public perceptions of older and younger people are improving—for example, whether more people agree with positive statements such as ‘older people contribute value to our community’ or ‘young people should be listened to on important issues’. A qualitative outcome might be found in the content of local narratives: whether

successful stories of intergenerational cooperation are circulated in the press or on social media, indicating that this coexistence is becoming part of the collective imagination. Research has indeed suggested that when society values older people's contributions and integrates them, age-based biases decline and social harmony is promoted (Wu et al., 2025). One indicator might therefore be that opinion leaders or local authorities begin to include messages against ageism and in favour of solidarity across age groups in their public discourse, reflecting cultural change.

Intergenerational social capital. This concerns whether community networks and forms of support that cross age boundaries are being strengthened. A quantitative indicator might be the 'number of autonomous intergenerational community initiatives' that emerge—for example, residents of different ages organizing a community garden, or clubs in which young people teach technology to older people outside the formal project framework. If the community internalizes the value of intergenerationality, we might see more spontaneous connections, such as young mothers relying on older women in the neighbourhood for childcare, or teenagers running errands for older neighbours. These actions can be captured through civic participation surveys asking questions such as: 'Have you collaborated with someone from another generation in the last month in a voluntary or mutual-aid activity?'. An increase compared with baseline would indicate that the community has gained social capital across generations. Community networks such as neighbourhood associations may also be rejuvenated through membership from all age groups. One possible indicator would therefore be whether the age composition of neighbourhood boards becomes more balanced.

Physical environments and shared services. This involves observing changes in the environment that reflect age integration. For example, the project might lead to the creation of an intergenerational space (a park with both exercise equipment for older people and children's play areas, community centres with programmes for younger and older people together, libraries running oral-history projects with older volunteers, etc.). The indicator in this case could be the number of public or community spaces adapted for multigenerational use. Accessibility can also be included, observing whether infrastructure improvements (ramps, benches) are promoted that benefit everyone—indicating that the community values its older residents and facilitates the participation of all ages in shared life. Another indicator might be that local programmes previously separated by age are now combined (for example, the town choir invites members of all ages rather than maintaining separate youth and senior choirs). These are signs of a community transformed in its everyday way of operating. Indeed, intergenerationally active communities have been observed to create

new physical or social structures that foster interaction between generations (Generations United, 2012), consolidating a tangible legacy of the project.

Impact on shared local issues. An intergenerational community can address cross-cutting problems (safety, the environment, etc.) through the combined strength of different age groups. One indicator would be whether certain community statistics related to the project improve. A municipality might, for example, monitor voter turnout among younger and older people (does the gap narrow, suggesting less generational civic distance?), or safety indicators in areas where younger and older people now know and look out for one another (do incidents of vandalism fall, or does perceived safety in parks increase after an intergenerational project there?). These indicators are difficult to attribute to a single intervention, but positive trends combined with testimonies linking them to the project would strengthen the evidence of social impact. One documented case showed that, after involving young and older people in community development plans, aspects of the local environment improved, including safer and cleaner parks, partly because of the sense of shared responsibility that had developed (Sánchez, 2009).

In summary, at the community level we seek evidence of broad social transformation: a more cohesive community, without pronounced age divides, and with a fabric of relationships and spaces that integrate generations. These indicators will tell us whether the proposed practices not only changed their direct participants but also 'took root' in local culture, laying the foundations for a society that is more inclusive of people of all ages.

Practical Example: Indicators Applied to the Intergenerational Dialogues Organized by UAM [It is frustrating to have discovered those reports only after running the groups; it would not have been difficult to incorporate some of these issues. And if we repeat the experience next year, but without catering or video, we could examine how it evolves. The testimonies collected, although still fragmentary, are illuminating.]

To illustrate how these indicators operate in practice, we can take as an example the focus groups organized for these dialogues, which have already been described in previous sections.

Individual level

Before the dialogues begin, each participant could be asked to complete a brief questionnaire about their perceptions and expectations regarding the other generation (for example, whether they believe they share concerns with the other age group, or how they

imagine their own future in relation to old age/youth). The questionnaire could be repeated after the three or four sessions. A clear indicator would be whether attitudes have changed. We might see, for example, an increase in empathy (young people becoming more understanding of the challenges of old age, and older people becoming more optimistic about today's youth).

We could also collect qualitative testimonies. Some students might say that 'talking to older people made me rethink how I want to balance my working and family life in the future', while an older participant might say, 'I now understand that young people today have concerns similar to those I had, only in a different context'. Such accounts would provide evidence of a certain degree of intergenerational understanding.

Another individual indicator could be historical or experiential knowledge. By sharing stories, we could ask whether participants learned from one another. This could be evaluated by asking them to mention something they learned ('Mention one lesson or anecdote from the other generation that had an impact on you'). If the vast majority can identify something specific, we will know that knowledge transfer took place and that the legacy of the past was valued.

Community level (group/social)

One stated objective of the UAM dialogues was to develop joint intervention proposals in the areas discussed (migration, artificial intelligence, climate activism, etc.). One indicator of social success would be the number and quality of the proposals generated. For example, if at the end of the sessions the intergenerational group produces a document containing five proposals (such as implementing an employment mentoring programme between retired people and young professionals, or creating an urban community garden maintained by schoolchildren and older people), this would demonstrate a certain degree of collective empowerment and willingness to act together for the community.

The dissemination of these results through the publication we are preparing would also be a useful indicator. The fact that the group's ideas reach other settings (other neighbourhoods, universities, NGOs or local authorities) would suggest a broader impact.

We can also measure group satisfaction, perhaps by asking both groups to write a short text stating whether they found the experience useful for the community and whether they would like to remain in contact or take part in follow-up actions. If a high percentage express an intention to continue collaborating or recommend replicating the dialogues in other settings, this would be a qualitative indicator that the initiative planted the seeds of intergenerational social cohesion beyond the one-off project.

Institutional level

In the case of UAM, we can observe the commitment of the university and partner organizations. One indicator could be the continuity or expansion of these intergenerational dialogues: Are there plans to repeat the dialogues with new groups next year? Do more faculties or other universities become involved after seeing the model? Consistency of participation could also be observed—for example, how many invited participants (students and older people) attended all scheduled sessions. High participation (around 80% attendance at each dialogue) would indicate a high degree of commitment and perceived value of the activity, which in turn encourages institutions to continue supporting it.

Another institutional indicator in this example would be the use of the results for purposes beyond academia. If the proposals developed are presented, for example, to Tres Cantos City Council or at a university event on social innovation, this would mean that the institution has amplified the intergenerational voice emerging from the project.

Finally, we could measure whether UAM integrates the lessons learned. The research team could, for example, develop a methodological guide based on this experience that would enable other institutions to replicate the dialogues. Such an intellectual output would indicate institutional impact in terms of the creation of knowledge and practical tools (a toolkit) for future initiatives.

In summary, this example shows how, for each specific practice, we can define a set of indicators covering everything from the personal transformation of participants to impact on the community and institutions. The key is to maintain a balanced evaluation framework: combining quantitative measures (surveys, event counts and statistics) with qualitative evidence (life stories and changes in attitudes and perceptions), while considering different levels (micro, meso and macro) in order to capture the complexity of social impact.

Conclusions

Developing intergenerational communities involves more than simply carrying out activities; it requires reflection on the changes we seek and evaluation of the extent to which, and through which strategies, they can be achieved. The dimensions described—social connection, cultural change, civic participation, well-being and institutional strengthening—provide a map for understanding an intergenerational community in its full breadth. The proposed indicators, organized by level, in turn provide concrete tools for measuring the social impact of CIVIS project practices across these dimensions.

We believe that, by using this evaluation framework as a guide, researchers, institutions, community organizations and students will be able to monitor and assess the outcomes of intergenerational interventions in a comprehensive and accessible way.

Ultimately, measuring impact is not only about accountability, but also about learning and improvement: the indicators suggested here make it possible to identify what works best and where adjustments are needed, helping to create a virtuous cycle of action and reflection in the construction of communities for all ages. As experts emphasize, intergenerational interventions, when properly planned and evaluated, generate mutual benefits and strengthen the social fabric (Sánchez, 2009; Generations United, 2012). Applying this evaluation framework will help ensure that these benefits are captured and that more institutions and communities are inspired to join the movement towards intergenerational solidarity.

References

- Generations United (2012) Intergenerational community building resource guide. Washington, DC: Generations United.
- Generations United (2022) Intergenerational evaluation toolkit. Washington, DC: Generations United.
- Generations Working Together (2015) Intergenerational programmes evaluation guide. Glasgow: Generations Working Together.
- Observatorio del Envejecimiento (2021) Ageism: social image of old age and age discrimination. Santiago de Chile: Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.
- Sánchez, M. (ed.) (2009) Intergenerational programmes evaluation. Madrid: Instituto de Mayores y Servicios Sociales (IMSERSO).
- Sánchez, M., Kaplan, M. and Sáez, J. (2010) Intergenerational programmes: an introductory guide. Madrid: Instituto de Mayores y Servicios Sociales (IMSERSO).
- World Health Organization (2021) Global report on ageism. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Wu, J., Elliott O'Dare, C. and Greene, J. (2025) 'Ageism and intergenerational dynamics in the workplace: a scoping review with implications for gender and sustainable human resource management (HRM)', *Gender and Sustainability in the Global South*, 2(1), pp. 281–308. <https://doi.org/10.1515/gsgs-2024-0010>