DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 461 CE 032 219

AUTHOR Sprouse, Betsy M.
TITLE Community-Based Learning Centers for Older Adults. Research Report.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Faye McBeath Inst. on Aging and Adult Life.
SPONS AGENCY Administration on Aging (DHHS), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 81
GRANT AoA-90-A-1613
NOTE 56p.; For related documents see CE 032 218-221.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Students; Comparative Analysis; *Continuing Education; Educational Research; Lifelong Learning; *Older Adults; *Participant Characteristics; Participation; *Student Motivation
IDENTIFIERS Community Learning Centers

ABSTRACT

A study compared the characteristics and participation motivations of older adult learners in age-segregated and age-integrated educational programs. The instrument for the research consisted of two parts--a Program Participants Survey to collect social and demographic information and Boshier's Education Participation Scale. Subjects were 482 older adult learners in two continuing education programs. The learners were, typically, married white women, 62-70 years old, who live in single family homes in urban areas and have fairly high educational and income levels. Results indicated age-integrated, university-based programs attracted lifelong learners who were well-educated, relatively affluent, and relatively young. Age-segregated, community-based programs attracted learners of diverse educational backgrounds and of more advanced age (over age 80) who were not frequent educational participants. Different learning environments attracted older adult learners whose motivational orientations exhibited some differences. While learners in all populations had the highest mean factor scores on Cognitive Interest, reasons related to Social Contact had more influence for age-segregated than for age-integrated learners. The latter group indicated that Social Welfare reasons influenced their participation in continuing education more. (YLB)

COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING CENTERS FOR OLDER ADULTS

RESEARCH REPORT

Betsy M. Sprouse

Published by: The Faye McBeath Institute on Aging & Adult Life
University of Wisconsin-Madison
7239 Social Science Building
1180 Observatory Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

This project was supported, in part, by grant number 90-A-1613 from the Model Projects on Aging Program, Administration on Aging, Office of Human Development Services, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D. C. 20201.

INTRODUCTION

Even though more and more older adults are involved in lifelong learning, interested in continuing their education, and taking classes and courses, very little has been done to make educational activities convenient and accessible to them. Colleges and universities are offering free or reduced tuition to older adults who want to audit classes, but few go to the campus. Many community agencies offer classes, but their offerings are not coordinated or planned so that a wide variety of classes are available to interested older people.

One solution is to bring a variety of classes and courses into one community facility, a place where older adults can come to learn many things--where they are comfortable and where they can have a chance to develop and teach their own courses. This is the learning center concept, one that says that educational opportunities should be brought to people in their own communities in response to the needs and interests of the residents.

In October of 1978, the Faye McBeath Institute on Aging and Adult Life at the University of Wisconsin-Madison applied for and received a grant from the Administration on Aging to conduct a research and demonstration program on "Community-Based Learning Centers for Older Adults." The purpose of this project was to study the process of how communities can energize their own resources to provide educational programs to older adults, and to determine the value of these programs for older adults. In order to document that process, the Institute on Aging provided seed money to three Dane County communities to assist them in developing Learning Centers. A local agency or organization in each community was selected to sponsor the Learning Center, and staff coordinators were appointed. Each Learning

Center also had a planning committee composed of older adults and community leaders. The project design consisted of six months of planning, a demonstration period of one year, and six months of research and evaluation.

The results of this research and demonstration project are documented in four publications. "Developing Community-Based Learning Centers for Older Adults" is a technical assistance manual which describes the steps involved in establishing a learning center, and provides suggestions for communities and groups of older adults. The second publication describes the evaluation of the model project, the third is this research report, and the fourth publication describes older adults as teachers. A monograph entitled Education and the Older Adult will be published by the Institute on Aging late in 1982.

The research described in this technical report was conducted with the Learning Center participants in the Spring of 1980. The study also included those older adults who were auditing classes as Guest Students on the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus. The purpose of the research was to compare the characteristics and participation motivations of older adult learners in age-segregated and age-integrated educational programs. This report is an overview of the study and its results. More detailed informa tion on the methodology and results can be found in Sprouse (1981) or the forthcoming monograph.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The field of older adult education--its concepts, issues, and problems--has been expanding rapidly since the early 1970's. As the number of older adults participating in continuing education increases, research on those participants and programs designed specifically for older learners also increase.

The typical study on education of older adults is descriptive, and examines either the characteristics of the participants or the nature and perceived value of the program. These descriptive studies, and the theoretical contributions of others, have done much to develop and shape the field of education for the older adult. However, gaps still exist in the knowledge base on education for the elderly. One of these gaps is in the area of motivation. Boshier (1971, 1973, 1976, 1977; Peters and Boshier, 1976) is one of the few researchers who has taken the concept of psychological motivation and applied it to the issue of participation in adult education and to the education of older adults (Boshier and Riddell, 1978). More research is needed on what motivates older adults to participate in different types of educational programs and environments.

Scope of Study

This research consisted of four areas of inquiry: (1) a descriptive study of older participants in two continuing education programs; (2) an analysis of the motivational orientations of those participants in relation to the educational environment; (3) a discussion of the results in relation to Boshier's (1971, 1977) theory of motivational orientation and life-space/life-chance; and (4) a translation of the results into recommendations for programming and marketing education for older adults.

Definition of Terms

Age-Integrated: Educational programs which allow and encourage the physical and psychological mix of older and younger learners. The phrase "psychological mix" is used to represent an interaction between older and younger learners which leads to shared experiences, exchange of knowledge and philosophies, and improved understanding of attitudes.

Age-Segregated: Educational programs which separate older adults from younger learners, both physically and psychologically.

Guest Students: Participants in the University of Wisconsin's Guest Student Program, which allows individuals aged 62 and older to audit classes on any campus on a tuition-free, space available basis (with permission of instructor).

Learning Center: In this research, it referred to a community-based learning center for older adults. The concept involves bringing learners, teachers, and educational

resources together in existing facilities which are convenient, accessible, and familiar to the learners because they use them for other purposes. The three pilot learning centers which served as research sites in this study were located on the east side of the city of Madison, the town of Belleville and the northwest quadrant of Dane County, Wisconsin.

Motivational Orientation: A descriptive concept developed by Boshier which combines the Houle/Sheffield concept of a learning orientation ("the major principle which gives meaning or direction to the continuing learning act or process undertaken by the adult learner" (Sheffield, 1964:2) with Maslow's typology of behavior as growth- or deficiency- motivated. Boshier uses the term as distinguishable from learning orientation because learning cannot be researched, only inferred from other factors.

Older Adults: While the descriptive parts of this study (i.e., the literature review) may refer to adults as young as age 55, the research subjects were aged 62 or older.

Theoretical Framework

The primary focus of this research was motivation--the reasons why older adults participate in continuing education. The construct used to explore this area was motivational orientation. This term has its roots in the learning orientation research of Houle (1961) and Sheffield (1964).

The concept of learning orientation was refined by Boshier in his research on motivation and participation (1971, 1973, 1976, 1977; Peters and Boshier, 1976; Boshier and Riddell, 1978) and tied to Maslow's (1968, 1970, 1971) theories of motivation and personality.

Boshier's research provided the theoretical framework for this research. In 1971, Boshier published the first of his research papers which combined the Houle/Sheffield learning orientation approach with the areas of motivation and participation. He developed the descriptive concept of "motivational orientation" to specify the multivariate motivations which influence adult education participation. Boshier purposefully avoided using Sheffield's concept of learning orientation, since motivation was being investigated, and learning is not necessarily related. In contrast to Houle and Sheffield, Boshier suggested that all adult education participants were goal-oriented, and their goals were related to how well they had satisfied their primary or basic needs.

Boshier's approach in this and subsequent research was to use his own Education Participation Scale, which consisted of statements of reasons for adult education participation drawn from Houle and Sheffield. The scale length varied, from its original 48 items to a short 35-item form used with older adults. The responses of adult learners to these items were factor-analyzed, and the motivational orientations which consist of related items emerged. Boshier's first use of the scale yielded four factors; it has since been refined to five factors: Escape/Stimulation, Professional Advancement. Social Welfare, External Expectations, and Cognitive Interest. When the Education Participation Scale was used with older adults, the job-related items were eliminated and four factors emerged: Escape/Stimulation, Social Welfare, Social Contact, and Cognitive Interest.

Boshier believed that motivational orientations were more than superficial clusters of reasons for enrollment. They were derived from needs and interests, and seemed to be surface manifestations of psychological states. These states were related to psycho-social conditions in various age and socio-economic groups (Boshier, 1977: 112). Motivational orientations appeared stable through time and space. Boshier's attempts to identify the social and psychological underpinnings of reasons for participation led him to develop a theoretical model of motivation which tied his research to Maslow's theory of motivation and personality.

Maslow's theory of motivation attributed behaviors (and thus their underlying motivations) to the individual's attempts to satisfy basic needs. As present needs were satisfied, other higher-order needs emerged which governed behavior. Maslow's needs were inferred, underlying, causal factors used to explain observed behaviors. He categorized these needs into a hierarchy which progressed from lower-order to higher-order needs: physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness and love needs, esteem needs, and the need for self-actualization (Maslow, 1968 and 1970).

Boshier's was an equilibrium model similar to Maslow's. Deprivation and drive were considered as the origins of action. People are endowed with tendencies which cause them to seek and maintain equilibrium, or the balance of tensions. Another way to state the deprivation/drive actions is that actions are guided by deficiency or growth tendencies. Those people whose needs are not met are in deficiency states. Those who are striving to meet higher needs are in growth states.

The tie-in between Boshier's research and that of Maslow was Boshier's technique of labeling motivational orientations as "life-space" (growth) or "life-chance" (deficiency). Life-chance and life-space are opposite ends

of a continuum. The continuum is a psychological dimension which underlies reasons for participation. Life-space oriented people participate in adult education for expression (i.e., to expand their life space). Life-chance oriented people participate in adult education in an attempt to cope with life (i.e., to meet lower-order needs). Some overlap exists between these concepts: a reason for participation could be growth to one person and deficiency to another.

Boshier's research on the motivational orientations of older adults toward educational participation produced four factors, generated from items on his Education Participation Scale. He labeled these factors:

I. Escape/Stimulation
II. Social Welfare
III. Social Contact
IV. Cognitive Interest

When factor scores were generated for his research population of older adults, Boshier found Cognitive Interest was the strongest factor, followed in decreasing order by Social Contact, Social Welfare, and Escape/Stimulation.

One final aspect of Boshier's motivational model is the labeling of the motivational orientations as characteristic of life-space or life-chance:

For Adults in General:

Escape/Stimulation	Life-chance
Professional Advancement	Life-chance
External Expectations	Life-chance
Cognitive Interest	Life-chance
Social Welfare	Life-space (but psychological foundations of this factor are weak)

For Older Adults:

Escape/Stimulation	Life-chance
Social Welfare	Life-space
Cognitive Interest	Life-space
Social Contact	———

(independent of psychological states; foundation too elusive to label when it is factorially separated from Social Welfare)

Labeling the factors was an attempt by Boshier to move motivational orientation research to a point where a psychological base or foundation can be attributed to reasons for participation. However, Boshier stated that attribution of life-chance and life-space labels to the Education Participation Scale factors remained tenuous and in need of further investigation (Boshier, 1977). He also stated that there is no completely satisfactory theory of social and educational participation. All one can do is group the relative independent variables into those influences essentially internal (psychological and cognitive) and those derived from the individual's external environment. Participation stems from the interaction of these variables (Boshier, 1973:256).

METHODOLOGY

Instrument Design

The instrument designed for this research consisted of two parts, a Program Participants Survey to collect social and demographic information, and Boshier's Education Participation Scale. These two parts were used as one survey, with an accompanying cover letter for each of the populations (see the Appendix).

The Program Participants Survey was designed to collect social and demographic information on the participants, information which can be compared with the participants' motivational orientations. The design of this survey was based on previous studies of older adult educational participation (Sarvis, 1973; Wood, 1976) and developed with the assistance of the University of Wisconsin's Survey Research Lab. It was reviewed for form and clarity, and pretested with 15 older adult respondents involved in a continuing education program at an elderly housing complex.

The Education Participation Scale was designed by Boshier in 1971. The form of the scale used in this study was adapted by Boshier and Riddell (1978) for use with older adults. It consists of 35 statements of reasons for participation in adult education programs. The format of the scale is such that response set and positional bias are eliminated. The mean test-retest reliability for this shortened version of the Education Participation Scale is .60.

The Populations

The subjects in this research were four populations of older adult learners in two continuing education programs. A census-type design was used to include all people who enrolled during a one-year period. The first group participated in the Guest Student Program at the University of

Wisconsin-Madison. These learners were adults aged 62 and over who audited courses on the Madison campus (an age-integrated environment) on a tuition-free, space-available basis. The population in this study was the 231 Guest Students on campus during the Summer Session of 1979 and Fall and Spring Semesters of 1979-80 (Table 1).

The second population of older adult learners consisted of 466 participants in three community-based learning centers for older adults. These learners were older adults (no minimum age restriction) in non-credit, age-segregated classes. The population was comprised of those who took part in each program from June 1979 to June 1980 (Table 2).

Data Collection

The data collection process began by notifying all participants in each program that the research effort was taking place. These letters explained the purpose of the research and requested their cooperation. The questionnaire was mailed in May 1980 to all people who participated in each program during the period of June 1979 to June 1980 (those in the programs in June 1980 had already enrolled by May). A stamped and pre-addressed return envelope was included with the questionnaire, along with a complimentary pen. Two follow-up requests were used to increase the response rate. The first follow-up was a postcard reminder, and the second (two weeks later) a duplicate questionnaire and return envelope. These efforts produced a response rate of 80 percent. The completed questionnaires were then edited and coded for computer processing.

Data Analysis

A two-stage analysis of the responses to the research instrument was conducted to address the study's major research questions:

Research Question I

Are there significant differences in the characteristics of older adult learners auditing classes on a university campus (an age-integrated environment) and those participating in similar programs in neighborhood locations (age-segregated environments)?

Hypothesis I-A: There are no significant differences among the three groups of learning center participants when compared on the following variables:

1. Age group
2. Educational level
3. Income
4. Educational participation
5. Sex

Hypotheses I-B: There are no significant differences between learning center participants as a whole and Guest Students when compared on the same five variables.

Rationale: Participation is a complex behavior, affected by forces both internal and external to the individual. While all the influences on participation cannot be identified or tested, certain characteristics have been shown to be associated with educational participation. The five major variables in this study were selected on the basis of the frequency with which they appeared in the literature (Graney, 1980; Aslanian and Bickell, 1980; Anderson and Darkenwald, 1979). These variables were used not to predict participation, but to detect differences among groups of older adult learners in different environments.

Methodology: A descriptive analysis was developed, using frequency distributions and cross-classification tables, of the social and demographic characteristics of the participants, and the relationship between these characteristics and the educational environment of the participants.

The Chi-square test was used to test for differences among and between groups of respondents. To establish homogeneity, the three groups of age-segregated learners were tested first. If no significant differences were found, then the age-segregated learners were treated as one group and compared to the age-integrated learners. If differences were identified, then all four groups were treated separately. In order to minimize the risk of Type II errors (accepting false null hypotheses), a significance level of .05 was used. If the test value of Chi-square fell below the critical value at the .05 level, the null hypotheses were not rejected.

Research Question II

Are there significant differences in the motivational orientations of older adult learners in age-segregated educational programs and those in age-integrated programs?

Hypothesis II-A: There are no significant differences between the mean factor scores of age-segregated and age-integrated learners.

Hypothesis II-B: For both age-segregated and age-integrated learners, the factor labeled Cognitive Interest is the strongest "motivator", i.e., the mean factor score for Cognitive Interest is greater than those for Social Contact, Escape/Stimulation or Social Welfare.

Rationale: Previous research using the Education Participation Scale (Boshier and Riddell, 1978; Pritchard, 1979) has provided information on a single group of learners in one type of educational environment. The mean factor scores and their relative strength differ from study to study, but no information was available on the impact of educational environment on mean factor scores. Lacking this information, it was hypothesized that the relative strength of E.P.S. factors would remain consistent when more

than one group of learners was involved.

Methodology: The mean factor scores for age-segregated learners and age-integrated learners were compared, using one-way analysis of variance to determine if significant differences existed among the group means at a .05 level of significane. The value of the mean factor scores for each group was used to assess the relative strength of each factor for each group of learners, and to determine how the participants' motivational orientations were related to Boshier's life-space/life-chance continuum.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section addresses the research questions and hypotheses of this study which were described above. The first question which seeks to identify differences among groups of older adult learners is addressed by presenting group frequency distributions. The second research question on the role of the motivational orientations for different learners is addressed by presenting the results of a factor analysis and an analysis of variance.

Characteristics of Respondents

Of the 624 questionnaires mailed to four populations of older learners 499 (79.96%) were returned and 482 (77.24%) were useable. By using the highest frequency of response for each question, it was possible to develop a generalized profile of the older adult learner who responded to the questionnaire.

The learners were typically married (52.2%) women (75.9%) between the ages of 62 and 70 (41.7%) who live in single family homes (62.4%) in urban areas (46.7%). They had an average of 2.86 children, spent their younger years in clerical jobs (18.5%) or as homemakers (15.6%), and now have a monthly income between $476 and $800 (26.6%). Using their own cars (72.4%), they participated in an average of 2.75 clubs or organizations on a regular basis, preferring those whose membership included people of all ages (61.8%). Although most were not enrolled in a class when they completed the questionnaire (62.2%), they had taken an average of 3.88 classes over the past two years, either academic (38.4%) or hobby and recreation (40.0%). These classes were in addition to an average of 13.27 years of formal schooling.

The data showed that these older adult learners were similar to the majority of adult learners in this country: married women in urban areas who have fairly high educational and income levels (Houle, 1961; Aslanian

and Brickell, 1980). However, they were in many ways more advantaged than other older adult learners, and should not be considered representative of that group as a whole. These learners were 99.5 percent Caucasian, 75.9 percent female, and 76.1 percent of them had 12 or more years of schooling. These characteristics, combined with their residence near a major university, make the nature of their educational participation different from that of other older adults.

Comparisons of Age-Segregated and Age-Integrated Learners

The characteristics of the learners described above indicate that as a group, they were homogeneous in many ways. On such variables as race, sex, place of residence, and educational level, most respondents had similar characteristics. The next stage in the research was to determine if differences among the learners emerge when the variable of learning environment is introduced (Research Question I).

Respondents were divided into four groups by the learning environment in which they participated (three age-segregated learning centers and one age-integrated program on a university campus). Comparisons were made among groups of age-segregated learners, then between age-segregated learners as a whole and age-integrated learners. The learning environment was treated as the dependent variable, although it was actually a classification rather than a true dependent variable which reflected changes in independent variables.

There are many variables on which the learners could be compared, variables which may or may not have a direct relationship to educational participation. Among adult learners, the characteristics most often used to "predict" educational participation are age, sex, educational level, income, and past educational participation (Graney, 1980; Aslanian and

Bickell, 1980; Anderson and Darkenwald, 1979). The association between these variables and educational participation is not so direct that one can accurately predict whether an adult will or will not participate in an educational program. However, certain characteristics have been shown to be associated with participation in numerous studies. Adults who are younger, female, with higher-than-average incomes, who have been to or graduated from college, and who have taken other adult education courses are more likely to participate in continuing education than adults who are older, male, less affluent, and have lower educational (and continuing education) levels (Anderson and Darkenwald, 1979; Houle, 1961; Graney, 1980; Uphaus, 1971).

Tables 3 through 7 compare the age-segregated and age-integrated learners on five major variables: age, educational level, income, level of educational participation, and sex. It was hypothesized that there were no significant differences among learning center participants on these five variables (Hypothesis I-A) or between learning center participants as a whole and Guest Students (Hypothesis I-B). Both these null hypotheses were rejected. Age-segregated learners differed on educational level, the variable most strongly associated with continuing education participation. Learners at the Belleville and Madison centers generally had a high school or college education, while the Northwest Dane learning center attracted learners from all educational levels. Age-integrated learners differed from age-segregated learners on all variables tested: age-integrated learners had a higher proportion of males, were younger than learning center participants, and had higher income and educational levels. Yet age-segregated learning centers attracted a greater percentage of older learners over age 70 as well as learners with more diverse educational backgrounds.

It seems that when older adults in different learning environments are

compared, the traditional association between such characteristics as age or educational level, and the phenomenon of educational participation, weakens. Traditionally, older adults who are fairly young (under age 70) and well-educated (high school or college) are more likely to be adult education participants than those who are older or not as well-educated. These relationships were strong among age-integrated learners, but not among age-segregated learners. The concept of a local learning center may be one method to attract learners who represent a wider age range and a greater diversity of educational backgrounds.

Factor Analysis

Boshier and Riddell's 1978 research established a factor structure for the Education Participation Scale when used with older adults. Factor analysis of the Education Participation Scale produced four factors, which Boshier labeled Escape/Stimulation, Social Welfare, Social Contact, and Cognitive Interest. All 35 scale items were included in these factors, although Boshier did include one item which had a factor loading of .39 instead of his established level of .40 or more (See Boshier and Riddell, 1978:169).

Boshier and Riddell reported a high face validity for the scale, and a significant correlation between the E.P.S. and three other scales which measured psychological states of older adults. They recommended that instead of continually trying to identify new orientations toward educational participation (or old orientations with new names), researchers and practitioners should use existing scales (such as the E.P.S.) to identify and analyze motivational orientations. Boshier has developed four un-correlated factors which can be used to produce factor scores and to identify motivational orientations.

In this research, Boshier's 35-item Education Participation Scale was included in the questionnaire without additions or changes. Of the 482 questionnaire respondents, 329 or 68.2 percent completed both the questionnaire and the E.P.S. With the elimination of respondents under the age of 62, the remaining 223 respondents provided data for the factor analysis.

The difference among the three groups of age-segregated learners and between the age-segregated and age-integrated learners precluded the development of one factor matrix for all 223 respondents. Thus Boshier and Riddell's matrix was used as a framework for comparing the four populations of this study.

The four factors identified by Boshier accounted for 48.99 percent of the variance associated with participation. Factor I, Escape/Stimulation, contained 18 items related to overcoming social deficiencies or reacting to suggestions from other people. Boshier considered these items to reflect life-chance motives.

(Continued on next page)

FACTOR I
Escape/Stimulation

	Item	Factor Loading
4.	To get relief from boredom	.70
7.	To overcome the frustration of day-to-day living	.69
24.	To get a break in the routine of home or work	.68
13.	To keep up with competition	.61
20.	To have a few hours away from responsibilities	.60
26.	To keep up with others	.55
5.	To carry out the recommendation of some authority	.54
10.	To stop myself from becoming a "vegetable"	.54
15.	To gain insight into my personal problems	.53
8.	To be accepted by others	.52
35.	To comply with instructions from someone else	.50
31.	To comply with the suggestions of someone else	.48
17.	To escape television	.47
29.	To escape an unhappy relationship	.47
9.	To supplement a narrow previous education	.45
30.	To provide a contrast to my previous education	.45
28.	To maintain or improve my social position	.44
23.	To provide a contrast to the rest of my life	.41

Factor II, Social Welfare, reflected the life-space motivations of people who enrolled in continuing education to acquire knowledge, attitudes, and skills to help them achieve social or community objectives. The minus signs in front of the factor loadings do not carry a negative connotation, but instead were a function of how the seven items correlated among themselves.

FACTOR II
Social Welfare

	Item	Factor Loading
2.	To share a common interest with my spouse or friend	-.49
19.	To gain insight into human relations	-.55
11.	To acquire knowledge to help with other educational courses	-.73
3.	To become more effective as a citizen	-.73
34.	To improve my ability to participate in community work	-.75
18.	To prepare for community service	-.80
25.	To improve my ability to serve mankind	-.83

Factor III, Social Contact, contained five items related to group activities and developing social relationships. The psychological foundation of this factor was too elusive to label precisely, as its items reflected both growth and deficiency drives. The meaning of the factor was clear, but not its role in the life-space/life-chance model.

FACTOR III
Social Contact

	Item	Factor Loading
27.	To improve my social relationships	-.63
12.	To fulfill a need for personal associations & friendships	-.69
33.	To make new friends	-.76
14.	To participate in group activity	-.81
22.	To become acquainted with congenial people	-.82

FACTOR IV
Cognitive Interest

	Item	Factor Loading
16.	To help me earn a degree, diploma or certificate	.39
32.	To learn just for the sake of learning	-.59
1.	To seek knowledge for its own sake	-.67
21.	To learn just for the joy of learning	-.69
6.	To satisfy an inquiring mind	-.72

Effect of Learning Environment on Motivational Orientation

Motivational orientations of the four populations were compared by assessing the strength of the mean factor scores. Using Boshier's factor matrix, the responses to the Education Participation Scale were arranged by factors, and mean scores computed for each factor. These means reflected the relative importance of the factor for each population. The factor scores were developed by summing responses made to the items in each factor, then dividing by the number of items to obtain a mean factor score. This was the approach that Boshier and Riddell (1978) recommended for practical application of the E.P.S. Also used by Morstain and Smart (1974), it does not have absolute regard for the contribution of each item, but "will be satisfactory for most purposes" (Boshier and Riddell, 1978:173).

Table 8 contains the results of the comparison of factor scores. Listed are the maximum score for each factor, the mean and standard deviation of the summed items, and the mean factor score for each population. The responses for each item were scored zero for "no influence", 1 for "little influence", 2 for "moderate influence", and 3 for "much influence".

The F-ratio is the result of a one-way analysis of variance conducted to determine if differences exist among group means using the .05 level of significance.

The results of the analysis of variance indicated that significant differences existed among the four populations on all four factors. Cognitive Interest was the most powerful factor for each population, generally followed in decreasing order by Social Contact, Social Welfare, and Escape/Stimulation. For the Guest Students, the order of Social Welfare and Social Contact was reversed.

Within the factors, the four populations exhibited the most variation on Social Contact. For the age-integrated learners, this factor had little to no influence. For the age-segregated learners in Belleville, Social Contact had little to moderate influence. The same relationship existed on the Escape/Stimulation factor: it had little or no influence for the Belleville learners. The populations were more homogeneous on the Social Welfare factor (which had little to no influence) and the Cognitive Interest factor (which had little to moderate influence). The highest mean for any population was the mean of 1.97 on Cognitive Interest for the Guest Students. This was a reflection of the fact that the factors did not account for all variance associated with the phenomenon of participation, only 48.99 percent.

The differences between the mean factor scores made it necessary to reject Hypothesis II-A: "There are no significant differences between the mean factor scores of age-segregated and age-integrated learners." Even when the design was modified to compare the four populations separately, this null hypothesis was still rejected. Hypothesis II-B, which stated "For both age-segregated and age-integrated learners, the factor labeled

Cognitive Interest is the strongest "motivator", i.e., the mean factor score for Cognitive Interest is greater than those for Social Contact, Escape/Stimulation, or Social Welfare," was accepted.

It is now possible to relate these learners' motivational orientations to Boshier's theoretical model of educational participation. By using the psychological labels he attached to each factor, learners can be located on the continuum of growth and deficiency which he theorized as underlying reasons for participation. At opposite ends of this continuum were life-chance motives (need to survive and acquire utilitarian knowledge, skills, and attitudes) and life-space motives (need to grow and express oneself).

Each population of learners was most strongly motivated by Cognitive Interest, which reflected life-space. These learners can be characterized as self-actualizing people seeking new stimuli to motivate their continued growth. They were in a state of change (heterostasis) as they moved beyond the gratification of their lower-order needs to a higher state of "being" (Maslow, 1968).

The second most powerful motivating factor for the Guest Students was Social Welfare, which also reflected life-space motives. For all three age-segregated populations, Social Contact ranked second. This factor contained items which reflected both life-space and life-chance. Although the meaning of the factor was clear, its location on the growth/deficiency continuum was not as clear. It is probable that participation of some age-segregated learners was influenced by life-space motives, and others were influenced by life-chance motives.

Although the growth/deficiency continuum is a somewhat artificial construct, it is one way to relate educational participation behavior to the psychological state of the learners. By doing so, it is possible to obtain

information about what motivates learners to participate in educational programs. The identification of motivational orientations can, in turn, assist educational programmers in the design and marketing of programs.

Summary of Results

The data in this study came from the responses of 80 percent of older adults enrolled during a one year period in four educational programs. These older adult learners were similar in many ways to the majority of adult learners in this country: married, Caucasian women who live in urban areas and have fairly high educational and income levels. In comparison to the majority of older adult learners, they were more educationally advantaged. Virtually no minority group members were represented in the populations.

Similarities Among Learners. The age-segregated learners in learning centers were homogeneous with regard to age (62-70), the number of children they had (3-5), their income ($476-800 per month) and perceived income ("enough to get along"), their sex (female), their educational participation (no classes taken except at learning centers), their religion (Protestant), and race (Caucasian). There were almost no similarities between age-integrated learners on the university campus and the age-segregated learners. The only variable on which no significant differences were found was race.

Differences Among Learners. In general, there were more differences among the learners than similarities, although some of these differences were influenced by the location of the educational program. The three groups of age-segregated learners exhibited significant differences on the variables of geographic residence, with whom they lived, type of dwelling, occupation, marital status, educational level, how they

perceived their health, and their mode of transportation. Age-integrated learners differed from age-segregated learners on all variables tested except race. The differences between age-segregated and age-integrated learners which are most likely to impact on their educational participation were their differences in age (age-integrated learners were younger), educational level (age-integrated learners had more years of schooling), income (higher for age-integrated learners), and educational participation (age-integrated learners had taken more classes in the past two years).

Motivational Orientations. The Education Paricipation Scale is used to identify learners' reasons for participation. Boshier and Riddell (1978) used the 35 items on this scale to create four factors: Escape/ Stimulation, Social Welfare, Social Contact, and Cognitive Interest. Mean factor scores were generated on these factors and were used to compare learners in four groups: age-segregated learners in the Belleville, Madison, and Northwest Dane learning centers, and age-integrated learners in the University's Guest Student program. Cognitive Interest was the most powerful motivational orientation for each population of learners. According to Boshier's model of educational participation, this would mean that the participation of both age-segregated and age-integrated learners was influenced by life-space motives, or growth drives. This placed the learners on the "growth" end of Boshier's motivation continuum. The continuum was a construct used by Boshier to relate psychological states to motives for participation in adult education. The model classifies these older adult learners as people who participated in education for expression and to be stimulated into continued psychological growth.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to obtain information on the characteristics and motivations of older adults who participated in age-segregated and age-integrated educational programs. Boshier's model of educational participation, which facilitates the identification and interpretation of motivational orientations, was used as the theoretical framework. The methodology used was an analysis of characteristics of four groups of older adult learners, a generating of factor scores off Boshier's Education Participation Scale, and an analysis of variance to detect differences among the four populations on mean factor scores.

The results of the research indicate that different learning environments attract different older adult learners. In this study, age-integrated, university-based programs attracted lifelong learners who were well-educated, relatively affluent, and relatively young. Age-segregated, community-based programs had the potential to attract learners of diverse educational backgrounds and learners of more advanced age (over age 80) who were not frequent educational participants.

Different learning environments also attract older adult learners whose motivational orientations exhibited some differences. While the learners in all populations had the highest mean factor scores on Cognitive Interest, reasons related to Social Contact had more influence for age-segregated learners than for age-integrated learners. The latter group indicated that Social Welfare reasons influenced their participation in continuing education more than Social Contact reasons.

The measurement of motivational orientations is a useful method for identifying the needs of adult learners. However, researchers using the Education Participation Scale or other tools should take into account the

influence of learning environment when researching more than one group of learners. Similar older adult learners in different learning environments can exhibit different reactions to the same motivational orientations.

Design and Marketing Recommendations

Participation, or the attraction and retention of participants, is a major concern of educational programmers. Planners need to be aware of the potential market for their programs, needs and goals of prospective learners, and the external forces which influence participation.

Boshier's Education Participation Scale was designed to provide information on motivations of participants rather than potential participants. Participants and nonparticipants are different in many respects, most notably in the act of participation. However, programmers who obtain information on current participants can test the results in their promotional strategies to determine if participation rates can be increased. There will always be adults who are independent learners or nonparticipants. Yet information about participants can be used to improve programming, and this improved programming may attract some adults who were nonparticipants.

Below are several recommendations for the design and marketing of educational programs for age-segregated and age-integrated older adult learners. They are based on differences in socio-demographic characteristics and motivational orientations identified in this research. The recommendations also reflect the influence of previous studies on educational participation of older adults.

Designing Educational Programs for Older Adults

1. Planners of age-integrated programs on college campuses can expect the older learners to be the relatively young elderly who have had a college education or some college experience. The intellectual challenge of the program should not be diminished to accommodate them. However, older learners should be allowed to participate for either credit or non-credit.

2. Older learners in age-segregated community programs are not as likely to have been to college, but are still fairly well-educated. Their learning and contributive needs might be well-met by classes whose format is altered to allow for greater discussion and contribution by the learners (social contact).

3. The disposable income of retired adults is usually less than that of adults who are still working, but a fee for an educational program may still be appropriate. A fee places value on the class, and can increase retention of the participants. The higher income level of age-integrated learners allows for the possibility of charging more for campus-based programs.

4. The design of age-segregated programs should accommodate the learners' interest in social contact as well as in the learning itself by including such things as mid-class coffee breaks, class trips, and social or class-related activities outside of class time.

5. Although the learners in each environment are interested in learning for the sake of learning, planners should note that learners in age-segregated environments are also concerned with the relevancy and application of what they have learned (i.e., to acquire utilitarian knowledge, skills and attitudes).

6. Similarly, learners in age-segregated environments are concerned with the social welfare aspects of learning and the possibility of making contributions to society.

Marketing Educational Programs to Older Adults

1. Planners of age-segregated community programs should take advantage of the ability of these programs to attract older learners (i.e., the old-old aged 75 and over). Program participation can be increased by directing recruitment efforts toward these learners since most very-old learners would not participate in a college-based program. Program advertising should stress the convenience and accessibility of neighborhood programs.

2. Similarly, age-segregated programs can capitalize on their appeal to learners of diverse educational backgrounds. The non-threatening atmosphere of the program in familiar surroundings can serve as drawing cards that increase participation.

3. College-based programs can capitalize on the prestige of the college to attract older adult learners. Emphasis should be placed on the prestige and intellectual challenge of college classes, and opportunities for self-fulfillment and exchange of ideas with learners of all ages and backgrounds.

4. Age-segregated programs seeking to increase participation rates should emphasize the opportunities for socializing while learning. Promotional materials should make reference to comfortable surroundings, friendly atmosphere, and opportunities to meet new people of the same age.

5. Marketing of age-segregated programs should also emphasize the relevance and application of learning to the lives of participants. Course content should be described in terms of the value of learning the topic itself, and its application to other needs and interests of the learners.

TABLES

TABLE 1

Guest Student Enrollment, 1979-1980

Year	Summer	Fall	Spring	Total
1979-80	29	104	98	231

Source: Office of Inter-College Programs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

TABLE 2

Learning Center Enrollment, 1979-1980

Center	Summer	Fall	Winter	Spring	Total
Belleville	56	102	74	29	261
East Madison	71	51	73	58	253
Northwest Dane County	51	60	100	36	247
Totals	178	213	247	123	761*

*Includes participants enrolled in more than one class.
The sample used is the unduplicated count of 466.

TABLE 3

Comparison of Respondents by Learning Environment Location and Age Group

Learning Environment Location	Age 62-70	Age 71-79	Age 80 & Over	Total
Age-segregated: Belleville Learning Center	30 42.85%	28 40.00%	12 17.14%	70 99.99%
Age-segregated: Madison Learning Center	47 50.54%	40 43.01%	6 6.45%	93 100.00%
Age-segregated: N.W. Dane Learning Center	37 40.22%	43 46.74%	12 13.04%	92 100.00%
Age-integrated: University Guest Students	87 66.41%	43 32.82%	1 .76%	131 99.99%
Total	201	154	31	386

Test for significant differences among age-segregated learners:
$X^2 = 5.673$; df = 4; probability = .22

Test for significant differences between age-segregated learners as a whole and age-integrated learners:
$X^2 = 23.350$; df = 2; probability < .001

TABLE 4

Comparison of Respondents by Learning Environment Location and Educational Level

Learning Environment Location	8 years of school or fewer	9-12 years of school	13-16 years of school	17 years of school or more	Total
Age-segregated: Belleville Learning Center	18 19.56%	50 54.35%	20 21.74%	4 4.35%	92 100.00%
Age-segregated: Madison Learning Center	12 11.01%	47 43.12%	40 36.70%	10 9.17%	109 100.00%
Age-segregated: N.W. Dane Learning Center	31 23.84%	53 40.77%	40 30.77%	6 4.61%	130 99.99%
Age-integrated: University Guest Students	3 2.31%	14 10.77%	46 35.38%	67 51.54%	130 100.00%
Total	64	164	146	87	461

Test for significant differences among age-segregated learners:
$X^2 = 14.121$; df = 6; probability = .03

TABLE 5

Comparison of Respondents by Learning Environment Location and Monthly Income Level

Learning Environment Location	Low Income $475 or less	Medium Income $476-1600	High Income $1601 +	Total
Age-segregated: Belleville Learning Center	26 28.89%	52 57.78%	12 13.33%	90 100.00%
Age-segregated: Madison Learning Center	27 26.73%	63 62.38%	11 10.89%	101 100.00%
Age-segregated: N.W. Dane Learning Center	37 30.83%	70 58.33%	13 10.83%	120 99.99%
Age-integrated: University Guest Students	8 6.96%	58 50.43%	49 42.61%	115 100.00%
Total	98	243	85	426

Test for significant differences among age-segregated learners:
$X^2 = .859$; df = 4; probability = .94

Test for significant differences between age-segregated learners as a whole and age-integrated learners:
$X^2 = 59.432$; df = 2; probability < .001

TABLE 6

Comparison of Respondents by Learning Environment Location and Level of Educational Participation*

Learning Environment Location	1-2 classes	3-5 classes	6 or more classes	Total
Age-segregated: Belleville Learning Center	49 49.49%	28 28.28%	22 22.22%	99 99.99%
Age-segregated: Madison Learning Center	35 30.70%	39 34.21%	40 35.09%	114 100.00%
Age-segregated: N.W. Dane Learning Center	62 45.25%	52 37.96%	23 16.79%	137 100.00%
Age-integrated University Guest Students	49 37.98%	62 48.06%	18 13.95%	129 99.99%
Total	195	181	103	479

*Educational Participation defined as number of continuing education activities undertaken in a two-year period.

Test for significant differences among age-segregated learners:
$X^2 = 15.559$; df = 4; probability = .007

Test for significant differences among age-segregated learners, controlling for current learning center participation:
$X^2 = 5.075$; df = 4; probability = .55

Test for significant differences between age-segregated learners as a whole and age-integrated learners:
$X^2 = 9.932$; df = 2; probability = .01

TABLE 7

Comparison of Respondents by Learning Environment Location and Sex

Learning Environment Location	Females	Males	Total
Age-segregated: Belleville Learning Center	72 83.72%	14 16.28%	86 100.00%
Age-segregated: Madison Learning Center	101 90.18%	11 9.82%	112 100.00%
Age-segregated: N.W. Dane Learning Center	112 84.85%	20 15.15%	132 100.00%
Age-integrated: University Guest Students	81 62.31%	49 37.69%	130 100.00%
Total	366	94	460

Test for significant differences among age-segregated learners:
$X^2 = 2.179$; df = 2; probability = .15

Test for significant differences between age-segregated learners as a whole and age-integrated learners:
$X^2 = 31.73$; df = 1; probability < .001

TABLE 8

Mean Factor Scores ur Populations of Older Adult Learners

Factors	Belleville Learning Center (N=42)	Madison Learning Center (N=69)	N.W. Dane Learning Center (N=59)	University Guest Students (N=114)	F-Ratio
I. Escape/Stimulation					
maximum score = 54					
Summed mean	17.52	14.13	12.58	9.41	F = 10.71
Standard deviation	9.69	9.42	10.45	6.00	
Factor mean	.97	.78	.70	.52	p < .05
II. Social Welfare					
maximum score = 21					
Summed mean	9.00	7.41	6.85	6.20	F = 4.09
Standard deviation	4.38	4.81	4.36	4.52	
Factor mean	1.28	1.06	.98	.88	p < .05
III. Social Contact					
maximum score = 13					
Summed mean	8.24	7 17	6.32	4.18	F = 15.25
Standard deviation	4.04		4.11	3.34	
Factor mean	1.65	1.43	1.26	.83	p < .05
IV. Cognitive Interest					
maximum score = 15					
Summed mean	8.88	9.41	8.46	9.86	F = 3.53
Standard deviation	2.52	3.07	3.07	3.00	
Factor mean	1.78	1.88	1.69	1.97	p < .05

REFERENCES

Anderson, Richard and Gordon Darkenwald. Participation and Persistence in American Adult Education. (Direction Papers in Lifelong Learning). New York: Future Directions for a Learning Society, College Entrance Examination Board, 1979.

Aslanian, Carol B. and Henry M. Brickell. Americans in Transition: Life Changes as Reasons for Adult Learning. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1980.

Boshier, Roger W. "Motivational Orientations of Adult Education Participants: A Factor Analytic Exploration of Houle's Typology." Adult Education, Vol. 21, No. 2, 1971, 3-26.

Boshier, Roger W. "Educational Participation and Dropout: A Theoretical Model." Adult Education, Vol. 23, No. 4, 1973, 255-282.

Boshier, Roger W. "Factor Analysts at Large: A Critical Review of the Motivational Orientation Literature." Adult Education, Vol. 27, No. 1, 1976, 24-47.

Boshier, Roger W. "Motivational Orientations Re-visited: Life-Space Motives and the Education Participation Scale." Adult Education, Vol. 27, No. 2, 1977, 89-115.

Boshier, Roger W. and Gail Riddell. "Education Participation Scale Factor Structure for Older Adults." Adult Education, Vol. 28, No. 3, 1978, 165-175.

Graney, Marshall J. "Participation in Education Among Older People." Alternative Higher Education, Vol. 5, No. 1, Fall, 1980, 71-86.

Houle, Cyril O. The Inquiring Mind: A Study of the Adult Who Continues to Learn. Madison, Wis.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1961.

Maslow, Abraham H. Toward a Psychology of Being. New York: Van Nostrand, 1962, 1968.

Maslow, Abraham H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954, 1970.

Maslow, Abraham H. The Farther Reaches of Human Nature. New York: Viking Press, 1971.

Morstain, Barry R. and John C. Smart. "Reasons for Participation in Adult Education Courses: A Multivariate Analysis of Group Differences." Adult Education, Vol. 24, No. 2, 1974, 83-98.

Peters, John M. and Roger W. Boshier, "Adult Needs, Interests, and Motives" in Chester Klevins (Ed.), Materials and Methods in Continuing Education. New York: Klevens, 1976.

Pritchard, David C. "Motivational Orientations of Older Adult Participants in Adult Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1979.

Sarvis, Robert E. "Educational Needs of the Elderly: Their Relationship to Educational Institutions." Final project report. Lynwood, Wash.: Edmonds Community College, March, 1973.

Sheffield, Sherman B. "The Orientations of Adult Continuing Learners" in Daniel Solomon (Ed.), The Continuing Learner. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1964.

Sprouse, Betsy M. "Motivations for Older Adult Participation in Age-Segregated and Age-Integrated Continuing Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1981.

Uphaus, Ruth M. "Educating Retirees." Adult Leadership, Vol. 20, No. 1 1971, 17-19.

Wood, Vivian. "A Study of Barriers to the Use of University Resources by Older Students and Ways of Overcoming Them." Unpublished project report. Madison, Wis.: Institute on Aging, University of Wisconsin, 1976.

APPENDIX

The Faye McBeath INSTITUTE ON AGING AND ADULT LIFE
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—MADISON
425 HENRY MALL MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706
Telephone (608) 263-4020

May 15, 1980

Dear Guest Student:

The Institute on Aging is involved in a research and demonstration project which is looking at the kinds of educational activities that older adults are participating in and the reasons they choose one program over another.

We are asking two groups of adult learners to help us with this research. Our group is those people who are taking classes at community learning centers in Madison, Belleville, and in the Northwest part of Dane County. The other group is made up of those people who have audited classes during the past year at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The information you provide us will help educators more effectively plan and market programs for older adults.

The Office of Inter-College Programs, which runs the Guest Student Program, has given us permission to send you this questionnaire. I hope that you will find it interesting, and that you will complete the survey and return it in the enclosed envelope by May 30, 1980.

I've enclosed a pen for your use in filling out the questionnaire. It's yours to keep -- my way of saying "thank you" for your help. There is also a card enclosed which you can send back if you would like to receive a copy of the research results.

Please be assured that all of your answers will be kept in the strictest confidence. We have used a code number on your survey and the envelope it was mailed in, but only to insure that you will not be sent more than one questionnaire. No one will be able to distinguish your responses from anyone else's.

I look forward to receiving your completed questionnaire soon, and I will thank you in advance for returning it. Please feel free to call me at 263-4718 (collect if need be) if you have any questions or if I can be of any help.

Sincerely,

Betsy M. Sprouse

Betsy M. Sprouse
Project Director

BMS:mcm
Enclosures

The Faye McBeath INSTITUTE ON AGING AND ADULT LIFE
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—MADISON
425 HENRY MALL MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706
Telephone (608) 263-4020

May 15, 1980

Dear Learning Center Participant:

Through your participation in classes at your local learning center (in Madison at St. Bernard's Church; in Belleville at St. Mary's Church; or in Mazomanie, Roxbury, Black Earth, or Cross Plains), you may be aware that the Institute on Aging is involved in a research and demonstration project on community education and aging. We are looking at the kinds of educational activities that older adults are participating in and the reasons why they choose one program over another.

In order to gain this kind of information, we are surveying those people who have taken classes at learning centers, and also those Guest Students who audit classes on the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus. The information you provide us will help educators more effectively plan and market programs for older adults.

I am asking you to help with this research by filling out the enclosed questionnaire. I hope that you will find it interesting, and that you will complete the survey and return it in the envelope provided by May 30, 1980.

I've enclosed a pen for your use in filling out the questionnaire. It's yours to keep - my way of saying "thank you" for your help. There is also a card enclosed which you can send back if you would like to receive a copy of the research results.

Please be assured that all of your answers will be kept in the strictest confidence. We have used a code number on your survey and the envelope it was mailed in, but only to insure that you will not be sent more than one questionnaire. No one will be able to distinguish your responses from anyone else's.

I look forward to receiving your completed questionnaire soon, and I will thank you in advance for returning it. Please feel free to call me at (608) 263-4718 (collect if need be) if you have any questions or if I can be of any help.

Sincerely,

Betsy M. Sprouse

Betsy M. Sprouse
Project Director

BMS:mcm
Enclosures

The Faye McBeath INSTITUTE ON AGING AND ADULT LIFE
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—MADISON
425 HENRY MALL MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706

Martin B Loeb, Director

Telephone (608) 263-4020

_____

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS SURVEY

The following survey is part of a larger research effort which will help the University learn more about adult learners and the programs that interest them. We appreciate the help you can give us when you complete the following survey.

This survey may look long, but it is not difficult. In fact, you may even enjoy completing it.

There is no need to put your name on this form. Your responses are confidential. The code number on top of this page is used only to insure that you don't receive more than one questionnaire. Please be frank in your responses, and thank you for your cooperation.

FOR THE FOLLOWING PLEASE CHECK OR FILL IN THE APPROPRIATE SPACES:

1. Where do you live?

____city ____town ____suburb ____country

2. In what type of dwelling do you live?

____apartment or condominium
____rooming house or hotel
____retirement center or group home
____Nursing home or long-term care facility
____single family house but not on a farm
____single family house on a farm
____other: _____ (write in)

3. Does anyone else live with you? (Check all that apply)

____spouse ____parent ____roommate
____children ____relative ____live alone

4. What is your marital status?

____never married ____widowed ____separated
____married ____divorced

PLEASE CHECK OR FILL IN THE APPROPRIATE SPACES.

5. If you have children, how many? _____

6. How many years of formal school did you complete? ____years

7. How many years of formal school did your spouse complete? ____year

8. How many years of formal school did your father complete? ____year

9. How many years of formal school did your mother complete? ____year

10. If you have children, fill in the number of years of formal school e child completed. #1___years #2___years #3___years #4___years

11. If you have brothers, fill in the number of years of formal school e brother completed. #1___years #2___years #3___years #4___years

12. If you have sisters, fill in the number of years of formal school e sister completed. #1___years #2___years #3___years #4___years

13. What is the title of your full-time job or position? If retired, what was the title of your last full-time job or position? Be specific, eg., teacher, plumber, homemaker, etc.

_____
(please write in)

14. Are you currently employed? ____no ____full-time ____part-time

15. What is the approximate total income of your household per month in dollars?

____under $325 ____$476 to $800 ____$1,601 to $2,500

____$326 to $475 ____$801 to $1,600 ____over $2,500

16. How would you describe your current financial position?

____can't make "ends meet" ____comfortable

____difficult to make "ends meet" ____well-to-do

____enough to get along ____wealthy

17. In general, how would you describe the present state of your health?

____very poor ____good

____poor ____excellent

____fair

PLEASE CHECK OR FILL IN THE APPROPRIATE SPACES.

18. What is your major means of transportation? (Check only one response)

___walking ____cab ____Senior transportation service

____my own car ____public bus

____rides from friends or relative ____private bus

19. Are you active in any clubs, church groups, community, fraternal, or union organizations, i.e. do you attend their functions on a regular basis? ____yes ____no

20. In how many of these groups are you now active? _____ (please write in number)

21. When you are active with a group of people, do you prefer the others to be:

____older than yourself

____younger than yourself

____about the same age as yourself

____of mixed ages

22. When you attend organization or group meetings of classes, do you prefer the leader or teacher to be:

____older than yourself

____younger than yourself

____about the same age

THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT APPLIES TO QUESTIONS #23 - 26:

In our society nearly everybody works. If you were given a chance of having NEVER to work again, how might you feel about leading a life without work?

23. How would you feel about leading a life without work?

____Would not like it at all ____Uncertain ____Like it very much

____Probably dislike it ____Probably would like it

PLEASE CHECK OR FILL IN THE APPROPRIATE SPACES.

24. How long would you like to go without working?

____1 month or less ____1 year ____5 years

____6 months ____2 years ____Forever

25. Would you feel guilty about not working?

____Not at all ____Uncertain ____Very much

____Probably not ____Somewhat

26. If you had (or have) children, would you like it if they did not work?

____No ____Uncertain ____Yes

____Probably not ____Probably like it

27. Have you taken, audited, or sat in on any kind of classes during the last two years?

____yes ____no

28. Are you currently enrolled in any classes or courses?

____no ____yes

29. What are the names (or titles) of the classes or courses you've taken within the last two years? Please be as specific as possible.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

30. If you have taken classes in the last two years, who sponsored or provided these classes? Please check as many as are appropriate.

____private group ____community center ____University

____church ____technical college ____Learning Center

____high school ____county or University extension ____Other_____ (please write i

PLEASE CHECK OR FILL IN THE APPROPRIATE SPACES.

31. When you take a class, do you prefer it to be:

____with people your own age on a college campus

____with people your own age in your community

____with people of various ages on a college campus

____with people of various ages in your community

32. What is your major source of information about classes or courses that you have taken? (Check only one response)

____newspaper ____special mailings to you

____radio ____posters

____television ____friends _____other
(please write in)

33. If you were to attend a class during the coming year, with whom would you attend? (Check only one response)

____a friend ____spouse

____a relative ____on my own

34. Are you: ____female ____male

35. What was your age on your last birthday?

____under 45 ____71-79

____45-52 ____80 or over

____53-61

____62-70

WE WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS #36 and 37, BUT YOU DO NOT HAVE TO FILL THEM IN.

36. What is your religious affiliation?

____Protestant ____Muslim ____Other _____
(Please write in)

____Catholic ____Jewish ____None

37. What is your race?

____American Indian ____Hispanic

____Asian ____Caucasian (White)

____Black/Afro American

FOR QUESTIONS # 38-52 PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT CORRESPONDS TO HOW OFTEN YOU DO THE FOLLOWING IN A TYPICAL WEEK.

	every day	4 times per week	3 times per week	twice per week	once per week	rarely
38. Watch television	5	4	3	2	1	0
39. Listen to radio	5	4	3	2	1	0
40. Read a newspaper	5	4	3	2	1	0
41. Read a book	5	4	3	2	1	0
42. Read a magazine	5	4	3	2	1	0
43. Work at a hobby	5	4	3	2	1	0
44. Talk to someone on the phone	5	4	3	2	1	0
45. Have friends or relatives visit in your home	5	4	3	2	1	0
46. Go out and do some shopping	5	4	3	2	1	0
47. Go to the movies	5	4	3	2	1	0
48. Attend church or church activities	5	4	3	2	1	0
49. Attend meetings of a club or organized group	5	4	3	2	1	0
50. Attend meetings of a class	5	4	3	2	1	0
51. Visit with friends or relatives at their home	5	4	3	2	1	0
52. Go out with friends or relatives	5	4	3	2	1	0

Please indicate below the extent to which each of the reasons listed below influenced your participation in the last course or class which you took. Circle one category for each question.

Sometimes the "much influence" category is on the right-hand side of the page, sometimes it is on the left. No reason for enrolling is any more or less desirable than any other reason. Please be frank. There are no right or wrong answers.

1.	To seek knowledge for its own sake	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
2	To share a common interest with my spouse or friend	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
3.	To become more effective as a citizen	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
4.	To get relief from boredom	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
5.	To carry out the recommendation of some authority	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
6.	To satisfy an enquiring mind	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
7.	To overcome the frustration of day to day living	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
8.	To be accepted by others	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
9.	To supplement a narrow previous education	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
10.	To stop myself from becoming a "vegetable"	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence

TO WHAT EXTENT DID THESE REASONS INFLUENCE YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE LAST CLASS YOU TOOK?

11.	To acquire knowledge to help with other educational courses	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
12.	To fulfill a need for personal associations and friendships	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
13.	To keep up with competition	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
14.	To participate in group activity	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
15.	To gain insight into my personal problems	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
16.	To help me earn a degree, diploma or certificate	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
17.	To escape television	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
18.	To prepare for community service	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
19.	To gain insight into human relations	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
20.	To have a few hours away from responsibilities	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
21.	To learn just for the joy of learning	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
22.	To become acquainted with congenial people	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
23.	To provide a contrast to the rest of my life	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
24.	To get a break in the routine of home or work	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
25.	To improve my ability to serve mankind	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
26.	To keep up with others	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
27.	To improve my social relationships	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence

TO WHAT EXTEND DID THESE REASONS INFLUENCE YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE LAST CLASS YOU TOOK.

28.	To maintain or improve my social position	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
29.	To escape an unhappy relationship	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
30.	To provide a contrast to my previous education	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
31.	To comply with the suggestions of someone else	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
32.	To learn just for the sake of learning	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
33.	To make new friends	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
34.	To improve my ability to participate in community work	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
35.	To comply with instructions from someone else	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence

Are there any other reasons not mentioned above for your participation in educational activities? If so, please state what they are:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE SURVEY! If you would like to have a copy of the report which summarizes the results, please complete the enclosed card and return it with your completed questionnaire.