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Introduction
The limitations of the current housing options for older adults in meaningfully supporting older adults’ preference to age-in-place (AIP), have led to the development of multiple innovative housing and service models. However, the potential of these models to support aging in place is not well understood and there is a paucity of empirical research in this area.

Table 1: Comparative Table of Innovative Housing Components for the Three Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovative Housing Components</th>
<th>COHOUSING</th>
<th>NORC-SSP</th>
<th>VILLAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation, civic engagement, empowerment</td>
<td>Bottom-up, implementation, management</td>
<td>Top-down, management</td>
<td>Bottom-up, implementation, management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based services</td>
<td>Common meal, educational &amp; recreational activities</td>
<td>Educational &amp; recreational activities, transportation</td>
<td>Grocery, transportation, social &amp; educational activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home care and social services</td>
<td>No (potential)</td>
<td>Social services, health care services</td>
<td>No (potential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support and social capital</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted physical and built environment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Home repairs</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Accessibility</td>
<td>No (partnership model=yes)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Accessible for medium/high income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acknowledgment:

References