

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 986

CG 019 795

AUTHOR Sheranian, Marilynn; And Others
 TITLE Senior/Student Shared Housing: Model Project.
 SPONS AGENCY Administration on Aging (DHHS), Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE 16 Mar 87
 GRANT 0090AL0012
 NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society on Aging (33rd, Salt Lake City, UT, March 13-17, 1987).
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
 Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Aging (Individuals); *College Housing; *College Students; Daily Living Skills; *Helping Relationship; Higher Education; *Housing; *Intergenerational Programs; Models; *Older Adults; Program Evaluation
 IDENTIFIERS *Shared Housing

ABSTRACT

Historically, when aging adults could no longer negotiate the difficulties of living alone, they faced either institutionalization or living with their children. Shared housing may be a viable third option for many aging homeowners. The University of Utah's Intermountain West Long Term Care Gerontology Center developed the Senior/Student Shared Housing Program, a model shared housing project matching older adults with college students. Students provide maintenance and chore services for the older homeowner in exchange for their room or their room and board. Since the first senior/student match was made in 1984, 82 matches have been made and 20 are currently functioning well. This paper describes the project, how contracts between seniors and students are made, and what forms and questionnaires are used. Listed are six benefits gained by the senior through the project, five benefits for students, six drawbacks for seniors, and seven drawbacks for students. Additional results on the program's effectiveness are presented from three sources of data: (1) questionnaire forms completed by seniors and students at the time of application; (2) a follow-up evaluation conducted 2 to 3 months into the match; and (3) a final termination assessment at completion. Twelve data tables are included. (NB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED279986

SENIOR/STUDENT SHARED HOUSING

Marilyn Sheranian, Josephine Kasteler, Marjorie Pett, Sally Marriott

CG 019795

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
 Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marilyn Sheranian

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society on Aging, 33rd, Salt Lake City, UT, March 13-17, 1987.

SENIOR/STUDENT SHARED HOUSING

ABSTRACT

Home-sharing can be a viable alternative to institutionalization for an elderly home owner. The University of Utah Long Term Care Gerontology Center has just completed a third-year evaluation of its model shared housing project matching students with older people. No money is exchanged. Students work for their room, or room and board, depending on the needs of the senior and services required. Elderly persons who need assistance and who could benefit from the companionship and protection offered by younger students are ideal candidates. Students enjoy financial help, companionship and a sense of altruism.

Both subjective and objective data show that shared housing can be a very positive and successful experience for seniors and students alike. Details of each party's perception of the arrangement and relationship are reported, including a list of the findings of what went well (benefits) and what did not go well (problems).

This type of model, intergenerational matching, is a highly cost-effective means of delaying institutionalization of the elderly home owner. Its strength is in the efficient use of already available resources, both material (housing stock), and human--bringing complementary and needful parties together.

ADDENDUM:

All the authors are associated with the Intermountain West Long Term Care Gerontology Center, University of Utah. They are Marilyn Sheranian, Josephine Kasteler, Marjorie Pett, and Sally Marriott. The Senior/Student Shared Housing Model Project was supported by a grant from the Administration on Aging, No. 0090AL0012.

SENIOR/STUDENT SHARED HOUSING

MODEL PROJECT

Most elderly Americans not only live independently, but prefer to do so. Approximately 75% of this population own their own homes, and are deeply attached to their residences, neighbors, and a lifestyle that has been comfortable to them for many years. Surveys on residential preference show that given a choice, most elderly would maintain their independence providing their health and finances held out. However, even with stable finances, advancing years can gradually erode this independence as the senior experiences the natural effects of aging. Loss of strength, the necessity of giving up driving, failing eyesight or hearing, or difficulty walking or climbing stairs, all present challenges to accomplishing basic tasks necessary for daily living. Another important and challenging reality the elderly face is loneliness.

Historically, when aging adults could no longer negotiate the difficulties of living alone, they faced one of two options: institutionalization, or, living with their children. Difficulties which can be the determining factor of seniors losing their independence are often relatively minor in nature. For instance, lacking physical strength, the senior might simply need bottles or cans opened on a regular basis so meals can be prepared, or some lifting and maintenance such as taking the garbage out, taking care of the yard, or help with housecleaning. Frequently, lack of access to transportation is another significant factor leading to institutionalization since the senior cannot meet his or her own needs.

In response to this situation, the notion of shared housing can be a viable solution for many aging home owners. Shared housing programs provide the community with a positive solution to a growing problem--how to avoid displacing the well elderly who are still alert and enjoying life in their home setting. Some of the characteristics that make shared housing programs so attractive are:

1. They are cost-effective: Shared housing programs can be run with very little overhead, utilizing paraprofessionals, while providing a valuable service to many, on a conservative budget.
2. They are based on a self-help, self-reliant model that engenders cooperation, sharing, caring, and independence through interdependence.
3. The program takes full advantage of already existing housing stock, thereby creating new housing without additional cost.
4. With the right parties matched, the living arrangement provides a distinct advantage to each partner. For the home provider, institutionalization can be postponed or delayed, fears related to crime are greatly reduced, and they can experience the enjoyment of companionship. On the other hand, the home sharer enjoys a positive economic incentive (free room and board), companionship, and a sense of altruism.

5. Living arrangements are flexible, and can therefore generally be adapted to meet the time and needs of each of the parties.

PURPOSE

The University of Utah's Intermountain West Long Term Care Gerontology Center is currently involved in a model shared housing project matching seniors with students.

Elderly persons who need assistance with house and yard chores and who could benefit from the protection and companionship offered by younger students are good candidates for a live-in companion. The program supports the independence of the elderly home providers enabling them to remain in their own homes and easing the financial burden of maintenance and chore services.

Students, who frequently need financial help while attending college, are pleased with the opportunity to provide these services to the older person in exchange for room and board. The program is unique in that there is no exchange of money. The students simply work for their room, or room and board depending on the needs of the senior person and the services required. At the same time, the students gain an awareness of and sensitivity toward the aging process.

The Senior/Student Shared Housing Program had its inception when the Center would frequently receive calls from elderly people or their families requesting guidance because the elderly person wanted to stay in his or her own home but could no longer maintain it without assistance. At the same time, Center personnel were aware of many university students who needed financial assistance and who would be willing to work for board and room. The idea was conceived that these two populations would make an ideal intergenerational match. Also, it would relieve families of the care of their aging loved ones and allow them the peace of mind that would come from knowing the elderly person was not alone.

The Center decided to implement a model that would bring the two age groups together and that could be evaluated to determine its value as a viable option for keeping the elderly independent and out of a long term care facility for as long as possible.

PROCEDURE

In the summer of 1983, the foundation work for this program began. The people involved in its inception included staff from the Center and some volunteer help from the community. Several months of preparation was needed before the first matches were formed and functioning.

Students were initially recruited through the Latter-day Saints (Mormon) Church student stakes on the University campus because they were well-established organizations. Home providers were also secured through Latter-day Saints stake presidents, and stake and ward Relief Society presidents. Any elderly who could benefit from this type of assistance, regardless of religious affiliation, were referred to the Center.

A very successful method of recruitment has been through the media--TV, radio, and newspaper articles. Also, flyers and posters have been distributed in colleges, universities, and senior centers. Much of the publicity on this program has come about through "word of mouth" from satisfied participants.

The first match was formed in January of 1984, and up to the present time, 82 matches have been made with 20 currently functioning well. Each match is individualized to meet the expectations and needs of the senior home provider and the student sharer by preparing a "Contract of Expectations" detailing what each will provide. Although not legally binding, the contract is a written, signed agreement that helps the participants feel more committed to a successful relationship.

Forms and questionnaires have been developed, tested, revised, evaluated, and finalized as the shared housing model has evolved. Initial contact information is recorded on a one-page form that defines the needs and preferences of the applicants.

Both students and older persons are encouraged to carefully read an overview explaining the program and are asked to complete a detailed application/questionnaire providing a broad background of information helpful in compiling data and forming matches. Students are required to submit three letters of reference before they are considered. The references are checked and students interviewed prior to any personal interviews with a senior provider and/or their families.

Usually, a staff person will go to the senior's home and take the shared housing material. In this way, the elderly and the home situation can be assessed and the program carefully explained and questions answered. Meeting older persons and their families is valuable in forming matches and achieving the rapport needed in gaining their confidence. Personal contact in the beginning and throughout the match is important and helps in monitoring the relationship during its existence.

A paper match is made when a senior and student seem suited to one another. Then an interview appointment is conducted so that the prospective participants and their families can meet, discuss schedules, expectations, needs, etc. If they like one another and feel they would like to match, then the "Contract of Expectations" is prepared, the student moves in, and the shared living begins. If they are not satisfied, then the process is repeated until the right companion is found.

The most important work is accomplished during the pre-match negotiating and immediately following the beginning of the match. This is the critical time when the senior and student are adjusting and most problems surface. It is important to resolve them early before they become unresolvable. If the relationship is shaky, counseling is available through the Center. If the participants feel they cannot correct the problems, they may decide to dissolve the match. They may or may not want to try another one.

As the match progresses, the coordinator monitors it closely and offers help. Matches are checked at regular intervals. The first one is by phone after a week or two and then a home visit evaluation is conducted after 2-3 months. Thereafter, matches are checked as often as is felt necessary. Something is learned from each one, and the "input" and suggestions from the participants help greatly in improving the program.

With sincere efforts on the part of both parties, shared housing can be a successful intergenerational relationship. Mutual benefits gained by seniors and students participating are worth the effort. Some of the benefits gained by the senior are:

1. Ability to continue to remain independent and in own home for as long as possible.
2. Companionship: loving/caring relationship--interacting with the same generation as grandchildren--a beneficial intergenerational relationship.

3. Protection: someone living in who would be alert to any problems/emergencies.
4. Relieve families of care of loved ones.
5. Preparation of meals: someone to prepare nourishing meals--especially an attractive, warm dinner.
6. Financial: home and yard maintenance help. It is more economical to remain at home with additional help.

Some of the benefits for students are:

1. Financial: this is the greatest benefit of all--being able to complete their education and prepare for their futures, etc.
2. Gaining a friend: feeling they are contributing to someone else's life--a rich intergenerational relationship.
3. Reaping the rewards of a wiser, older person who could be a master teacher.
4. Developing an awareness of and sensitivity to the aging process.
5. Learning patience, compassion, understanding, etc.

Drawbacks for seniors from our experience are these:

1. Students schedules too busy: not having enough time--not home enough to fulfill terms of the contract.
2. Lack of honesty on part of students on services agreed upon: Many try to "slide" by, get away with as much as they can--not meeting expectations.
3. Incompatibility: not being able to adjust to one another's personality.
4. Lack of privacy and some loss of independence.
5. Shock of sharing with another generation who are not as neat and organized in personal habits.
6. Trying to understand another generation: to be patient and tolerant.

Drawbacks for students that have been reported in some cases are:

1. Must sacrifice time: more to do and more responsibilities.
2. Loss of privacy: must report/account to an authority figure. (just like being at home).
3. "Generation gap": years separating present realistic challenge that requires much effort, patience, etc.

4. Feeling that older people have little tolerance for very busy students.
5. Feeling uncomfortable in someone else's home--using their things, etc.
6. Personality conflicts.
7. Different values/views.

RESULTS

Data for this paper were taken from three sources: the detailed questionnaire form completed by seniors and students at the time of application to the program; a follow up evaluation conducted two to three months into the match; and, a final termination assessment at the completion, or finalization of the match. These results represent a subsample of our population since a final, updated assessment of the project is currently in process.

Seniors served by the program are primarily the old-old (median age being 84 years), female, and have lived alone 20 years or more (see Table 1-A.). Those seniors matched in the program were significantly different from seniors not matched with respect to their need for assistance with the following daily activities: garbage, cooking, and laundry (each with $p < .01$); and, vacuuming, changing bed linens (each with $p < .05$) (Table 3.). Also, the seniors that were matched had a greater need for transportation services in that they drove or used public transportation less than the unmatched population, and demonstrated a higher prevalence of mobility restrictions: difficulty getting in and out of cars, and need of a walker or crutches (Table 4.).

Services which were most frequently contracted for in the "contract of expectations" between the senior home provider and his/her student home sharer were: housecleaning - particularly kitchen, bath, laundry, and vacuuming; meals; and yard work such as watering, mowing, and weeding. Companionship was also a major consideration in the proposed arrangement (Table 9.).

Students participating in the program are mostly female, 20-24 years old, unmarried, and university junior class level or higher (see Table 1-B). There was an under-representation of science/engineering majors selected for matches, while students interested in the shared-living arrangement, and also matched, were fairly evenly distributed among the other academic areas. Financial need was a significant characteristic ($p < .01$) of those students selected for participation in the program (Table 2-B.).

At the time of follow up, home providers and students ranked "personable (kind, friendly, patient, sense of humor)" and "companionable (willing to help, close like a friend)", respectively, as the two most important characteristics they appreciated in their companions. (Tables 5-A. and 5-B.).

It was encouraging at this time, that in relation to personal qualities disliked in the partner, all home providers and young adults selected "no problem" for one of their three responses, thereby suggesting to us that those characteristics they did choose were not of a serious nature. Fifty percent of the seniors cited interpersonal differences between themselves and their students as a characteristic they disliked, and, 72% of the students criticized the home provider's personality (Tables 6-A. and 6-B.).

Participants of matches which endured long enough to be followed for 2-3 months, or more, were, by a majority, very favorable in their report on how well things were going, and the degree to which expectations were being met (Table 7-A.). Home providers reported that companionship was the best thing about living together, and students reported financial benefit and companionship respectively, as the two best features of their living arrangement (Table 7-B.).

Again, success of the matches was highlighted when at follow up home providers, as well as students, each selected "no problems" as one of their three possible answers when asked what kinds of problems had come up during the match. Those issues which were reported as problematic for the home providers and students alike tended to be practical in nature, or, reflected sensitivity/difficulty in adjusting to one another (see Tables 8-A. and 8-B.).

At termination, 85% of the program participants still reported that no difficult issues had occurred, and that the match had been a positive experience. Of those specific issues reported, incompatibility was most frequently mentioned, with the student being more critical of the senior than the other way around. Other issues which were seen as problematic were: unmet expectations; the home provider's deteriorating health; and conflicts stemming from the young adult's life arrangements such as school load, personal problems, or social life (Table 10.).

In conclusion, we feel that the overall shared-living arrangement between the senior home provider and student live-in companion has been a positive experience for both parties. This impression is reinforced not only by each party's tendency to report favorably on the other at the time of follow up, as reported above, but also, a preliminary assessment of the reason(s) for dissolution shows that 59% of those matches assessed at termination, did so for reasons other than problems between the parties. In order of frequency, those matches which were considered a 'successful completion' dissolved because of: unrelated events, the home provider's deteriorating health, or death of the home provider. Matches which were assessed as terminating 'unsuccessfully', did so either because of unmet expectations or incompatibility, each of which was reported with the same frequency.

Table 1-A.
Demographic Characteristics of Senior Home Providers¹
Data Collected Through Year 2 Of Program

Characteristics	Matched N = 49		Unmatched N = 30		Total Sample N = 79	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Sex:						
Male	12	24.5%	3	10.0%	15	19.0%
Female	32	65.3%	24	80.0%	56	70.9%
Couples	5	10.2%	3	10.0%	8	10.1%
Age:						
Under 65	4	8.8%	1	3.4%	5	6.7%
65 - 69	3	6.5%	5	17.2%	8	10.7%
70 - 74	3	6.5%	3	10.3%	6	8.0%
75 - 79	6	13.1%	3	10.3%	9	12.0%
80 - 84	13	28.2%	8	27.6%	21	28.0%
85 - 89	10	21.8%	5	17.2%	15	20.0%
90 +	7	15.1%	4	13.8%	12	14.7%
(Matched: \bar{R} = 55 to 96 ; \bar{X} = 81.00 ; Md = 84.00)						
(Unmatched: \bar{R} = 50 to 95 ; \bar{X} = 79.35 ; Md = 82.00)						
Religious Affiliation:						
LDS	28	57.1%	18	72.0%	46	62.2%
Protestant	9	18.4%	5	20.0%	14	18.9%
Other	2	4.1%	2	8.0%	4	5.4%
None	10	20.4%	-	0.0%	10	13.5%
Marital Status:						
Married	9	18.4%	6	20.7%	15	19.2%
Widowed	35	71.4%	20	69.0%	55	70.5%
Divorced	3	6.1%	3	6.9%	6	7.7%
Never Married	2	4.1%	-	3.4%	2	2.6%
How Long Lived Alone (Years):						
Less than 1 year	3	6.7%	3	11.1%	6	8.3%
1 - 4	7	15.6%	9	33.3%	16	22.2%
5 - 9	5	11.1%	3	11.1%	8	11.1%
10 - 14	5	11.1%	3	11.1%	8	11.1%
15 - 19	5	11.1%	3	11.1%	8	11.1%
20 +	20	44.4%	6	22.2%	26	36.1%
(Matched: \bar{R} = 0 to 57 ; \bar{X} = 18.38 ; Md = 15.00)						
(Unmatched: \bar{R} = 0 to 50 ; \bar{X} = 11.19 ; Md = 6.00)						

1. Incomplete reporting in some categories.

Table 1-B.
Demographic Characteristics of Student Home Seekers²
Data Collected Through Year 2 Of Program

Characteristics	Matched N = 49		Unmatched N = 83		Total Sample N = 132	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Sex:						
Male	17	34.7%	27	32.5%	44	33.3%
Female	29	59.2%	39	47.0%	68	51.5%
Couples	3	6.1%	17	20.5%	20	15.2%
Age:						
Under 20	3	6.1%	6	7.2%	9	6.8%
20 - 24	21	42.9%	42	50.6%	63	47.7%
25 - 29	10	20.4%	26	31.4%	36	27.3%
30 - 34	6	12.2%	4	4.8%	10	7.6%
35 +	9	18.4%	5	6.0%	14	10.6%
(Matched: \bar{R} = 18 to 47 ; \bar{X} = 26.8 ; Md = 25.00)						
(Unmatched: \bar{R} = 17 to 54 ; \bar{X} = 25.3 ; Md = 24.00)						
Religious Affiliation:						
LDS	34	72.3%	57	72.2%	91	72.2%
Catholic	3	6.4%	7	8.9%	10	7.9%
Other	2	4.3%	3	3.8%	5	4.0%
None	5	10.6%	8	10.1%	13	10.3%
Marital Status:						
Married	6	12.5%	13	15.7%	19	14.5%
Widowed	2	4.2%	8	9.6%	10	7.6%
Divorced	3	6.3%	2	2.4%	5	3.8%
Never Married	37	77.1%	60	72.3%	97	74.0%
Student Status/Class Level:						
Not Enrolled	4	8.2%	6	7.2%	10	7.6%
Freshman	12	24.5%	7	8.4%	19	14.4%
Sophomore	4	8.2%	17	20.5%	21	15.9%
Junior	12	24.5%	22	26.5%	34	25.8%
Senior	8	16.3%	13	15.7%	21	15.9%
Graduate Student	9	18.4%	18	21.7%	27	20.5%
(Matched: Md. = Junior)						
(Unmatched: Md. = Junior)						

2. Incomplete reporting in some categories.

Table 2-A.

Selected Personal Characteristics of Senior Home Providers¹
 Data Collected Through Year 2 Of Program

Characteristics	Matched		Unmatched		Total Sample	
	\bar{X}	Md	\bar{X}	Md	\bar{X}	Md
Perceived Health (Possible Range 1 - 7)	3.90	4.00	3.72	4.00	3.85	4.00
How Nervous (Possible Range 0 - 3)	1.96	2.00	1.85	2.00	1.91	2.00
How Lonely (Possible Range 0 - 3)	2.08	2.00	2.27	3.00	2.13	2.00
Self-Esteem (Possible Range 1 - 7)	4.66	5.00	4.52	5.00	4.61	5.00
Financial Satisfaction (Possible Range 1 - 3)	1.98	2.00	2.04	2.00	2.00	2.00
Satisfaction With Pres. Living Arrangement (Possible Range 1 - 7)	4.87	5.00	4.52	5.00	4.73	5.00
Relationship With Other Family Members (Possible Range 1 - 5)	4.02	4.00	3.69	4.00	3.89	4.00
Number Of Times Last (3) Months Seen Friends	5.69	2.50	9.78	2.00	7.17	2.50
Number Of Neighbors Could Visit	3.41	3.00	4.76	3.00	3.86	3.00
Number Of Organizations Belong To	0.66	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.77	0.00
Have A Confident						
No	3	6.3%	9	22.1%	12	15.8%
Yes	45	93.8%	19	67.9%	64	84.2%

1. Low scores = very poor, low, unsatisfied; high scores = excellent, high, extremely satisfied.

Table 2-B.
 Selected Personal Characteristics of Student Home Seekers²
 Data Collected Through Year 2 Of Program

Characteristics	Matched		Unmatched		Total Sampl.	
	\bar{X}	Md	\bar{X}	Md	\bar{X}	Md
Perceived Health (Possible Range 1 - 7)	6.57	7.00	6.60	7.00	6.58	7.00
How Nervous (Possible Range 0 - 3)	0.63	1.00	0.68	1.00	0.66	1.00
How Lonely (Possible Range 0 - 3)	0.76	1.00	0.93	1.00	0.86	1.00
Self-Esteem (Possible Range 1 - 7)	6.27	6.00	6.31	6.00	6.29	6.00
Financial Satisfaction (Possible Range 1 - 3)	1.37	1.00	1.69	2.00	1.57	2.00
Satisfaction With Pres. Living Arrangement (Possible Range 1 - 7)	4.45	4.00	4.51	5.00	4.50	5.00
Number Of Times Last (3) Months Seen Friends	17.91	15.00	18.47	12.00	18.25	14.00
Number Of Organizations Belong To	1.90	2.00	1.59	2.00	1.70	2.00
Own Automobile						
No	33	68.8%	57	68.7%	90	68.2%
Yes	15	31.3%	26	31.3%	41	31.8%
Student Status/Major						
Business	11	24.4%	16	21.6%	27	22.7%
Liberal Arts	10	22.2%	14	18.9%	24	20.2%
Science/Engineer.	5	11.1%	16	21.6%	21	17.6%
Social/Behavior. Sc.	11	24.4%	17	23.0%	28	23.5%
Other	7	15.6%	8	10.8%	15	12.6%
Undeclared	1	2.2%	3	4.1%	4	3.4%

 2. Low scores = very poor, low, unsatisfied; high scores = excellent, high, extremely satisfied.

Table 3. Number of Senior Home Providers Who Require Assistance¹
 In Selected Activities of Daily Living
 Data Collected Through Year 2 Of Program

Activity	Matched		Unmatched		Total Sample	
	n	Yes (%)	n	Yes (%)	n	Yes (%)
Bathing	25	52.1%	15	53.6%	40	53.9%
Dressing	21	43.8%	7	25.0%	28	36.4%
Putting on Shoes	16	33.3%	8	29.6%	24	31.6%
Hair Care	30	62.5%	13	46.4%	43	55.8%
Shaving	5	12.5%	1	4.2%	6	9.2%
Eating	9	19.1%	3	10.7%	12	15.8%
Going to Toilet	10	20.8%	7	25.9%	17	22.4%
Walking	23	47.9%	11	40.7%	34	44.7%
Up or Down Stairs	31	66.0%	10	37.0%	41	55.4%
Get Around House	10	20.8%	3	10.7%	13	16.9%
Leaving House	34	70.8%	17	63.0%	51	68.0%
Reach or Stoop	26	54.2%	13	46.4%	39	51.3%
Shopping	43	91.5%	22	78.6%	65	86.7%
Taking Medicine	14	29.2%	9	33.3%	23	30.3%
Take Out Garbage	42	87.5%	17	63.0%	59	78.7%
Cooking	43	91.5%	19	67.0%	62	82.7%
Vacuuming	44	91.7%	21	75.0%	65	85.5%

1. Different number (n) reporting per activity.

Table 3. Number of Senior Home Providers Who Require Assistance
 In Selected Activities of Daily Living (continued)
 Data Collected Through Year 2 Of Program

Activity	Matched		Unmatched		Total Sample	
	n	Yes (%)	n	Yes (%)	n	Yes (%)
Scrub Floors/Bathrm	41	85.4%	21	77.8%	62	82.7%
Doing Laundry	44	91.7%	19	67.9%	63	82.9%
Changing Bed Linens	39	81.3%	18	64.3%	57	75.0%
Answering the Phone	5	10.4%	6	21.4%	11	14.3%
Dialing the Phone	6	12.5%	8	28.6%	14	18.2%
In or Out of Bed	9	18.8%	6	21.4%	15	19.5%
Need Help With Following:						
Physically Unable	40	83.3%	21	72.4%	61	79.2%
Go Out of House	37	77.1%	17	58.6%	54	70.1%
Take Places	21	43.8%	10	34.5%	31	39.7%
Difficulty Seeing	20	41.7%	10	34.5%	30	38.5%
Difficulty Hearing	11	22.9%	7	24.1%	18	23.1%

Table 4.
Senior Home Providers Reporting On Personal Mobility Limitations
Data Collected Through Year 2 Of Program

Activity	Matched		Unmatched		Total Sample	
	n	Yes (%)	n	Yes (%)	n	Yes (%)
Able to Drive	5	10.4%	5	17.2%	10	12.8%
Able to Walk	36	75.0%	24	85.7%	60	78.9%
Use Public Transp.	3	6.4%	7	25.9%	10	13.3%
Able to Get In and Out Cars, etc.	20	47.6%	16	64.0%	36	52.9%
Use Cane	23	52.3%	14	51.9%	37	52.1%
Use Walker	25	55.6%	12	46.2%	37	51.4%
Use Crutches	22	55.0%	7	26.9%	29	43.9%
Use Wheelchair	23	54.8%	15	57.7%	38	55.9%

Table 5-A.

Personal Qualities In Young Adult Senior Home Provider Reported Liking¹
 Three Month Follow Up
 (N = 43 Responses)

Personal Quality	n	%
Personable	14	32.6%
Kind, friendly	7	
Pleasant, happy, positive	4	
Patient	2	
Sense of humor	1	
Companionable	11	25.6%
Willing to help, companionable	4	
Close, like a friend	3	
Cooperates	2	
Likes siblings	2	
Empathic	8	18.6%
Understanding	4	
Cares about older people	2	
Compassionate	2	
Other	5	11.6%
Sweet person	2	
Fine character	2	
Appreciative	1	
Trustworthy	2	4.7%
Honest	1	
Mature and responsible	1	
Physical Abilities	2	4.7%
Strong	1	
Good Cook	1	
Interpersonal Compatibility	1	2.3%
Similarity of interests	1	

 1. Total follow up sample n = 18, each of which could give up to three responses.

Table 5-B.

Personal Qualities In Senior Home Provier Young Adult Reported Liking¹
 Three Month Follow Up
 (N = 39 Responses)

Personal Quality	n	%
Personable	10	25.6%
Kind, friendly	4	
Pleasant, happy, positive	2	
Sense of humor	2	
Quiet, mellow	1	
Patient	1	
Companionable	9	23.1%
Easy to live with	3	
Willing to help, companionable	2	
Close, like a friend	2	
Friend of family	1	
Likes siblings	1	
No Special Characteristics	8	20.5%
Other	7	17.9%
Fine character	3	
Sweet person	2	
Female	1	
Caucasian	1	
Empathic	2	5.2%
Understanding	2	
Physical Abilities	2	5.2%
Non-drug user	1	
Drives a car	1	
Respect For Differences	1	2.6%
Fair	1	

 1. Total follow up sample n = 19, each of which could give up to three responses.

Table 6-A.
 Personal Qualities In Young Adult Home Provider Reported Disliking¹
 Three Month Follow Up
 (N = 37 Responses)

Personal Quality	n	%
No Problems	21	56.8%
Interpersonal Differences	8	21.6%
Adjusting to one another	4	
Incompatibility	2	
Personality conflicts	1	
Differing values, views	1	
Unmet Expectations	3	8.1%
Not fulfilling expectations	2	
Not doing all that's needed	1	
Student's Personality	3	8.1%
Senior could not please young adult	2	
Young adult stubborn	1	
Practical Issues	2	5.4%
Conflicting schedules	2	

 1. Total follow up sample n = 16, each of which could give up to three responses.

Table 6-B.

Personal Qualities In Home Provider Young Adult Reported Disliking¹
 Three Month Follow Up
 (N = 47 Responses)

Personal Quality	n	%
No Problems	23	48.9%
Home Provider's Personality	13	27.7%
Forgetful	5	
Student could not please home provider	2	
Stubborn	2	
Moody	2	
Demanding, complaining	1	
Talks too much	1	
Interpersonal Differences	5	10.6%
Adjusting to one another	2	
Personality conflicts	2	
Age gap	1	
Loss Of Independence	3	6.4%
Lack of freedom	1	
Less control over household duties	1	
Senior watching young adult work	1	
Personal/Space	3	6.4%
Lack of privacy	2	
Senior had drinking problem	1	

 1. Total follow up sample n = 18, each of which could give up to three responses.

Table 7.
Selected Partnership Information Collected At Three Month Follow Up

How are things going between you and your shared housing partner?

	Senior Home Sharer (N = 19)		Young Adult (N = 18)	
	n	%	n	%
Not Well, Many Problems	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Some Problems	5	26.3%	5	27.8%
Could Be Better, But OK	1	5.3%	0	0.0%
OK	1	5.3%	0	0.0%
Good	7	36.8%	10	55.6%
Very Well, Excellent	5	26.3%	3	16.7%

(Median for Senior and Young Adult = Good)

Is your partner meeting your original expectations?

	Senior Home Sharer (N = 19)		Young Adult (N = 18)	
	n	%	n	%
No, Not At All	1	5.3%	2	11.1%
Rarely	3	15.8%	1	5.6%
Off And On	4	21.1%	1	5.6%
Mostly	3	15.8%	4	22.2%
Almost Always	1	5.3%	4	22.2%
Yes, Completely	7	36.8%	6	33.3%

(Median for Senior and Young Adult = Almost always)

Table 7. (continued)
 Selected Partnership Information Collected At Three Month Follow Up

What is the best thing about living together?

	Senior Home Sharer (N = 16)		Young Adult (N = 17)	
	n	%	n	%
Less Expensive	1	6.3%	10	58.8%
Companionship	7	43.8%	5	29.4%
Companionship			2	
Feeling needed			1	
Exchang. differ. ideas			1	
Able to share			1	
General/Physical Assistance	3	18.8%		
Doctor Recommend.	3	18.8%		
Meals	1	6.3%		
Everything	1	6.3%		
Nothing			1	5.9%
Independence			1	5.9%

What is the worse thing about living together?

	Senior Home Sharer (N = 15)		Young Adult (N = 17)	
	n	%	n	%
No Problems	6	40.0%	5	29.4%
Worry				
About young adult	1	6.7%		
About home provider			4	23.5%
Personality Conflicts, Different Values	2	13.3%	3	17.6%
Too Many Visitors	2	13.3%		
Lack Of Privacy	1	6.7%	2	11.8%
Lack Of Freedom			2	11.8%
Loss Of Control In Household Affairs			1	5.9%
Conflict In Schedules	1	6.7%		
Not Having Extra Guest Room	1	6.7%		
Senior Needs Young Adult Of Same Sex	1	6.7%		

Table 8-A.

Types Of Problems That Came Up For Senior Home Provider During Match¹
 Three Month Follow Up
 (N = 48 Responses)

Problem	n	%
No Problems	18	37.5%
Practical Issues	8	16.7%
Conflicting schedules	4	
Not home enough	2	
Too many visitors	1	
Not providing enough transportation	1	
Interpersonal Differences	6	12.5%
Adjusting to one another	4	
Personality conflicts	1	
Communication problems	1	
Unmet Expectations	6	12.5%
Not fulfilling expectations	3	
Not doing what's needed	3	
Young Adult's Personality	3	6.3%
Moody	1	
Lack of discipline	1	
Senior could not please young adult	1	
Personal/Physical Space	3	6.3%
Lack of privacy	1	
Mixing up laundry	1	
Sharing bathroom	1	
Financial	2	4.2%
Increased expense	1	
Salary problems	1	
Other	2	4.2%
Young adult does not help with meals	2	

 1. Total follow up sample n = 18, each of which could give up to three responses.

Table 8-B.
Types Of Problems That Came Up For Young Adult During Match²
Three Month Follow Up
(N = 45 Responses)

Problem	n	%
No Problems	18	40.0%
Other	11	24.4%
Senior needed physical assist. most of the time	3	
Too many household chores	2	
Felt trapped/obligated	2	
Other	4	
Home Provider's Personality	7	15.6%
Demanding, complaining	2	
Could not please senior	2	
Lack of discipline	1	
Talks too much	1	
Stubborn	1	
Interpersonal Differences	6	13.3%
Adjusting to one another	4	
Personality conflicts	2	
Loss Of Independence	1	2.2%
Having to check in with another	1	
Physical/Personal Space	1	2.2%
Lack of privacy	1	
Financial	1	2.2%
Salary problems	1	

2. Total follow up sample n = 18, each of which could give up to three responses.

Table 9.
Room And Board Contracted For The Following Services¹
(N = 120 Responses)

Services	n	%
Housecleaning	40	33.3%
Kitchen and bath	13	
Laundry	10	
Vacuuming	10	
Keeping room clean	4	
General cleaning	3	
Meals	19	15.8%
All meals	11	
Evening meal only	4	
Help with cooking	3	
Menu planning	1	
Yard Work	17	14.2%
Watering, mowing, weeding	9	
Snow removal	5	
Watering	2	
Garbage out	1	
Personal Benefits	17	14.2%
Companionship	10	
Protection	3	
General personal	2	
Walking with	2	
Personal Care	14	11.7%
General personal care	6	
Bathing/showering (shampooing hair, etc.)	5	
Medication (remind)	2	
Watch carefully	1	
Errands/Transportation	13	10.8%
General errands	5	
Shopping	5	
Drive to appointments	3	

1. Total termination sample = 20 matches, each of which gave six responses (N=120) for contracted services.

Table 10.
Issues Between Parties During Match¹
(N = 53 Responses)

Issues	n	%
No Difficult Issues, Positive Experience	17	32.1%
Incompatibility	17	32.1%
Senior difficult to get along with	6	
Senior too demanding of young adult's time	4	
General incompatibility	3	
Young adult losing interest	2	
Young adult difficult	1	
Young adult taking advantage of senior	1	
Unmet Expectations	7	13.2%
General dissatisfaction	4	
Communication problems	2	
Not enough companionship for senior	1	
Physical/Mental Illness	5	11.3%
Physical health deterioration	4	
Mental health deterioration	2	
Other	5	9.4%
Young adult's school load too heavy	2	
Young adult's had personal problem come up	2	
Young adult clashed with senior's returning wife	1	
Unrelated Events	1	1.9%
Young adult wanted more social life (dating)	1	

1. Total termination sample = 20 matches, each of which could give up to three responses.

Table 11.
Selected Characteristics Of Terminated Matches
(N = 20)

Characteristic	n	%
Written Agreement Between Parties (N = 20)		
Yes	18	90.0%
No	2	10.0%
Number Of Hours Young Adult Provided To Senior Per Week (N = 17)		
Less than 20 hours	0	0.0%
20 to 21 hours	16	94.1%
56 hours	1	5.9%
At Termination Did Senior Want Another Match (N = 19)		
Yes	9	47.4%
No	6	31.6%
Undecided	4	21.0%
If No, What Other Plans Are Known To Senior (N = 13)		
Senior will try relying on own support group	3	23.1%
Will try hired help	2	15.4%
Will try living alone	2	15.4%
Senior now in nursing home	2	15.4%
Senior would like another student if health improves	2	15.4%
Will maybe try program later	2	15.4%
At Termination Did Young Adult Want Another Match (N = 18)		
Yes	6	33.3%
No	10	55.6%
Undecided	2	11.1%
If No, What Other Plans Are Known To Young Adult (N = 11)		
Moving into apartment	6	54.5%
Moving back home	2	18.2%
Getting married	1	9.1%
Finding a regular job	1	9.1%
Will maybe try program later	1	9.1%

Table 12.
Reason For Termination Of Match By Duration
(N = 19)

Reason For Termination	Less Than 1 Month	1 - 3 Months	4 - 6 Months	7 - 9 Months	9 + Months
Physical/Mental Problems of Home Provider		1	2		
Death		1		1	
Unmet Expectations	2* **		2***		
Incompatibility	2		1	1	
Unrelated Events		3	1	1	1****

Note: * also listed Unrelated Event as reason for termination.
 ** and *** also listed Incompatibility as reason for termination.
 **** Match lated for 20 months.