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**Abstract:** Lifelong learning programs meet older adults’ educational needs and further support their health and well-being leading to more successful aging. In particular, university-based lifelong learning programs have provided older adults with opportunities to not only develop skills and knowledge but also expand new social networks with people of different ages. This study evaluated a university-based lifelong learning program, Program 60, to identify the relationships between participants’ experiences in the program and their quality of life. An online survey was employed, and 107 participants completed the self-report survey. The participants reported that classes helped increase their emotional satisfaction and that they enjoyed taking classes with younger students. Their experiences in the program reliably predicted their psychological and social elements of their quality of life (p=.004, p=.019 respectively). Study results provide helpful information for the development of lifelong learning programs that are responsive to the increasing demands of older adults.
Introduction

As an increasing number of people want to achieve successful aging and improve quality of life during retirement, lifelong learning has received a great amount of attention in research as well as practice (Crimmins & Cambois, 2003; Findsen, 2006; Hammond, 2004a, 2004b; Narushima, 2008; Williamson, 1997). Previous studies have demonstrated several benefits of participants in lifelong learning, such as effective social engagement in later life, improved quality of life, and physical and emotional health and well-being (Everard et al., 2000; Gallegos-Carrillo et al., 2008; Isherwood, King, & Luszcz, 2012; Park, 2009; Sertoz et al., 2009; Thomas, 2011).

Lifelong learning for older adults occurs mostly at nonprofit organizations and libraries. This trend has continued over the past 10 years domestically and internationally (Butcher & Street, 2009). Lifelong learning programs offered by organizations aim to meet older adults’ learning needs and address the importance of staying active and engaged during retirement (Metlife Foundation, 2007). Not only that, public libraries support older adults to access library resources for their independent learning opportunities (Butcher & Street, 2009). Unlike other educational opportunities for older adults, university-based lifelong learning programs have unique benefits for the participants. The participants can experience not only a quality education but also engage in various programs and services provided on campus. Also, university-based lifelong learning programs can play an important role as an intergenerational experience where older students can interact with younger students and faculty members.

This study evaluated a university-based lifelong learning program, Program 60 at The Ohio State University. Program 60 provides older adults who are 60 and older and reside in Ohio with free education opportunities through the University. Using an online survey, the study
examined participants’ motivation to participate in the program and their perceived benefits of the program. Data was also collected on participants’ program experiences including class satisfaction, relationships with classmates and instructors, and self-rated quality of life measures. In addition to descriptions of the program and participants, the study focused on the unique contribution of participants’ program experiences to their quality of life including physical, psychological, social, and environmental elements.

**Literature Review**

**Lifelong Learning for Older Adults**

The number of older adults age 65 and older has rapidly increased, comprising more than 20% of the total population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). The older population is projected to grow up to 84 million by 2050. As baby boomers have reached their retirement age, it is crucial to pay attention to baby boomers’ distinct characteristics (Hooyman & Kiyak, 2011). Hooyman and Kiyak (2011) argued that baby boomers are more physically active and healthier and not afraid of challenging restrictions on their roles and activities in their later life.

Lifelong learning has become an essential part to support older adults’ successful and active aging. Lifelong learning was first propounded in the 1919 Report of the Adult Education Committee, Ministry of Recommendation in Great Britain (Ireland & Spezia, 2014). This report stressed the importance of education throughout the entire lifetime. Since then, lifelong learning has been deliberated in international conferences such as the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)’s general meetings. In 1964, the UNESCO conference highlighted the theory of lifelong learning that knowledge and skills acquired earlier in individuals’ lives deteriorate as they age (Parkyn, 1973). Because of this perception, education opportunities for older adults have been advocated, and the 1971 White House Conference on
Aging discussed lifelong learning to support aging populations. During the White House Conference on Aging, lifelong education as a basic human right was underscored. Efforts to support lifelong learning for older adults have continued. The 2015 White House Conference on Aging recognized the need for societal attention and public investment in lifelong learning because lifelong learning had been developed predominantly in an individual level (Moody, 2015).

Learning does not only refer to meeting individuals’ intellectual needs. McClusky (1974) conceptualized older adults’ learning needs as coping, expressive, contributive, and influential (Tam, 2012). Coping needs refer to engaging in physical health and/or pursuing economic self-sufficiency. Expressive needs reflect participation in activities based on personal motivations. Contributive needs are individuals’ desires to contribute to the society. Finally, influential needs speak to an individual’s need to become an agent for social change (Findsen, 2006). Therefore, lifelong learning for older adults should be developed based on an understanding of culture and supporting social participation through leisure or productive engagement activities (Knapp, 1976; Merriam & Lumsden, 1985).

**Benefits of Lifelong Learning for Older Adults**

Lifelong learning offers a wide range of benefits to older adults as well as the community as a whole (Hammond, 2004a, 2004b; Narushima, 2008; Schuller, 2004). Through lifelong learning opportunities, people expand their capacity and interests. Moreover, participants experience improved physical and emotional well-being (Beck, 1992; Findsen & Formosa, 2010). Learning stimulates older adults’ psychological or emotional functions and further improves memory capabilities (Fielding, 1999; Weinstein, 2004). Previous researchers have also found
that lifelong education increased cognitive function and prevented symptoms of depression and anxiety among participants (Findsen & Formosa, 2010; Withnall, 2010).

Social engagement in lifelong learning positively impacts participants’ health (Umberson & Montez, 2010; Williamson, 1997). Lifelong learning programs enable the participants to meet new people and form new relationships with others. Given that social engagement has a positive relationship with physical and mental health for older adults (Herzog, Ofstedal, & Wheeler, 2002; Merriam & Kee, 2014; Park, 2009; Parker, Strath, & Swartz, 2008; Tomaka, Thompson, & Palacios, 2006), older adults utilizing lifelong learning opportunities are likely to be healthier and have higher quality of life (Crimmins & Cambois, 2003; Findsen, 2006; Hammond, 2004a, 2004b; Mitchell, 2007; Narushima, 2008; Williamson, 1997). These positive consequences are not only resulted from educational attainment but also from intermediate resources that people gain through schooling, which can be influenced by societal and personal life stages (Narushima, 2008).

University-based Lifelong Learning Programs

A number of studies have indicated that a university-based lifelong learning program can be viewed as a community-based program for older adults to improve their quality of life and satisfy the diverse needs of older adults (Crimmins & Cambois, 2003; Findsen, 2006; Hammond, 2004a, 2004b; Mitchell, 2007; Narushima, 2008; Williamson, 1997). While allowing older adults to take classes, attend events, and utilize various resources provided on campus (Carle, 2006), university-based lifelong programs can promote older adults’ overall quality of life.

Compared to other lifelong learning programs provided at local community centers, a university is a great place for intergenerational engagement. Older adults have an opportunity to interact with younger students and faculty members. Older adults can share their knowledge and
life experience with younger students in class. Not only that, older adults can also receive positive energy from younger students and others that may keep them more active and engaged to the community. Furthermore, university-based lifelong learning programs benefit younger students. Romack (2004) found that younger students’ perceptions on aging was positively influenced by interaction with older adults. By working with one another, younger students can recognize and value older adults as useful and contributing members in society.

Program 60. Program 60 is a university-based educational program for older adults living in Ohio. As a tuition-free, noncredit and non-degree program, older adults take classes, including online courses, offered at The Ohio State University. The Office of Distance Education and eLearning (2016a) explained that Program 60 was launched in January 1974. Anyone who are older than 60 and live in Ohio can register for Program 60. Their previous education background nor income does not matter for enrollment. The participants are able to take an unlimited number of classes and utilize other resources as other college students do. In the first year of the program, the total number of the participants was 185 in more than 200 different classes (Office of Distance Education and eLearning, 2016a).

Although Program 60 has been operating for the last 40 years, an evaluation of this program has not been conducted. This study examined Program 60 by identifying participants’ motivation to participate in the program and their perceived benefits of the program. The purpose of the study was to investigate the association between physical, psychological, social, and environmental elements of the participants’ quality of life and program experience including class satisfaction and relationships with classmates and instructors. The authors hypothesized that participants’ quality of life can be predicted by their experiences in the program.
Method

Study Design and Sampling

The study used a cross-sectional design that employed a self-report survey using internet survey software, Qualtrics. The survey invited 289 older students who were registered with Program 60 at the time of data collection. The data was collected for a two-week period in early April 2015. The survey took the participants approximately 15 minutes to complete. The survey asked demographic information, general questions about participants, program experiences, and self-rated quality of life using the WHOQOL-BREF field trial version (World Health Organization [WHO], 1996). A convenience sample consisting of 107 participants completed the survey, yielding a response rate of 37.02%. The achieved response rate is considered adequate considering that the common response rate for online surveys is approximately 33% (Nulty, 2008). This study was supported by the Office of Distance Education and eLearning at The Ohio State University.

Study Procedure

Prior to data collection, the office director sent an e-mail explaining the purpose of the study and the survey process to the program participants. Also, flyers were posted in the office and on its website. Program 60 requires all of the participants to have a personal e-mail account and encourages them to be familiar with the internet because all of the participants have to register classes online. The e-mail recruitment strategy as well as the online survey was considered appropriate. The study was introduced via group e-mails including a link to the consent form and the survey.

The survey was anonymous, and participation in this study was completely voluntary. Respondents were able to refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to
which they were otherwise entitled. Moreover, the participants were informed that their decision on whether or not to participate in the survey would not affect their academic results. The first author mainly responded to questions from the participants during the survey process. Confidentiality was given full consideration during that time. The Ohio State University Office of Responsible Research Practices has reviewed and determined this study exempt from IRB review.

Participants

Out of 107 people who participated in the study, 51.4% were male and 46.7% were female. The mean age of the participants was 67.97 (SD = 5.711). The oldest participant was 89 years old. The majority of the participants were white / non-Hispanic (90.7%), compared to Hispanic / Latino (2.8%) and African-American (1.9%). While 69% of the participants were married or lived with others, 15.9% of them were divorced and 7.5% had never been married. Among the participants, 75.7% reported a religious affiliation, such as Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish. Also, 46.7% had a master’s degree, 22.4% had a bachelor’s degree, and 12.1% had a doctoral degree. Less than 10% of the participants had some college, high school, or equivalent education. Lastly, 49.5% of the participants identified their annual income more than $80,000 and 22.4% identified between $50,000 and $79,999. Less than 8% of them had below $29,000 of annual income. Around 68% of the participants expressed that they were satisfied with their income, but 8.4% were not satisfied with their income.

(Insert Table 1)

Measures

Demographic information including age, gender, race, religion, marital status, education background, and financial status were collected. Survey questions focused on three constructs:
participants’ perspectives about the program, participants’ experiences during the program, and
their quality of life. To gather participants’ perspectives about the program, questions included
how the participant learned about the program, motivation to participate in the program,
perceived benefits of the program, the number of years involved in the program, the number of
classes taken, and membership in the Program 60 Association which is a non-profit organization
that supports new participants to adjust to a new school life (The Office of Distance and
eLearning, 2016b). Finally, participants were asked about their class satisfaction and
relationships with classmates and instructors. These questions were asked separately based on
each class that participants were taking with response options ranging from 1 (extremely
negative) to 5 (extremely positive).

The WHO Quality of Life-Brief final trial version (WHOQOL-BREF) was employed to
measure participants’ quality of life. The items were also rated on a 5-point Likert scale with the
lowest score of 1 to the highest score of 5. This measure has been shown to be reliable and
performed well on tests of validity (Skevington, Lotfy, & O’Connell, 2004). The WHOQOL-
BREF is considered to be suitable for assessing quality of life of individuals with various
demographic characteristics and social and health conditions (Skevington, Lotfy, & O’Connell,
2004). The WHOQOL-BREF contains 26 items based on four elements: physical health
(activities of daily living, mobility, etc.), psychological health (negative and positive feelings,
self-esteem, etc.), social relationship (personal relationship, social network, etc.), and
environment (financial resources, opportunities for acquiring new information and skills, etc.),
including two items directly asking the overall quality of life and general health condition.
According to the WHOQOL-BREF guideline, scores on each element were computed and
converted to transformed scores of 4 to 20. Scores less than or equal to 9 are considered as ‘low-
level of quality of life’, scores between 10 and 14 as ‘mid-level of quality of life, and scores more than 15 were regarded as ‘high-level of quality of life.’

Using SPSS Statistics 22, descriptive statistics were utilized to present collected data on general information about participants. Then, univariate analysis was employed to examine the relationship between participants’ experiences in the program and their quality of life. Multiple regression was separately used to examine if participants’ class satisfaction and relationships with classmates and instructors can partially explain each element (physical, psychological, social, and environmental) of quality of life.

Results

The survey participants have engaged in Program 60 for almost 3 years on average (M=2.9, SD=1.64). Approximately one third of the participants have enrolled in the program for shorter than one year and 40.2% have been participating in the program for longer than 3 years. The average number of classes that the participants have taken for the entire academic year(s) with the program was 5.48 (SD=3.517). A little bit more than 40% of the participants have taken less than three classes, while another 40% of them have taken more than 10 classes since first joining Program 60. The average number of classes taken during one semester was 1.43 (SD=0.839). At the time of the survey, nearly 70% of the participants were taking one class, 18.7% of them were taking two classes, and 8.5% of them were taking more than three classes. Lastly, 42 survey participants (39.3%) were involved in Program 60 Association. Among those 42 members, 83.3% said they were satisfied with the Program 60 Association.

(Insert Table 2)
Motivation to Participate in the Program

When asked about how participants first learned about Program 60, the participants were invited to select all responses that applied to their situations. More than half of the participants (53.3%) first learned about the program from people that they know, such as family members, friends, or neighbors. Others said that they received information about the program via various media methods including newspaper, radio, and internet advertisement. The participants identified knowledge building (86.9%) as the biggest motivation to participate in the program. They also indicated that they decided to participate in the program because they can take classes offered at the university (51.4%), they can have free learning opportunities (47.7%), they wanted to enjoy their life (42.1%), and they wanted to make friends (6.5%). Additionally, some people mentioned that they wanted to build a professional network, stimulate their intellectual and mental functioning, and stay active. The participants also discussed that the program allows them to review subjects that they have studied before or helps them make a successful transition into retirement.

Perceived Benefits of the Program

Participants (94.4%) indicated new learning opportunities were the most useful aspect of the program. Also 61.7% said that taking classes helped them improve emotional satisfaction, whereas 38.3% said that it was helpful for improving physical satisfaction. The participants thought that the program was more useful to expand social network with younger generations (38.3%) than with other older participants in the program (20.6%). Among those who agreed that the program helped them build social network with other participants, 59.1% were members of the Program 60 Association ($\chi(1) = 4.571, p = .033$). Other perceived benefits included receiving formal training on campus and having the opportunity to have educational opportunities that they
have missed earlier in their life. Also, some people indicated that the program helped them achieve their goals such as traveling abroad or applying for a Master’s program.

The Participants’ Program Experience and their Quality of Life

The scores to examine participants’ program experiences and quality of life were ranged from 1 (negative) to 5 (positive). The average score of the class satisfaction was 4.45 (SD=0.96). The level of relationship with classmates appeared to be weaker than that with instructors. The average score of the relationship with classmates was 2.91 (SD=0.99), compared to 3.62 (SD=0.91) with instructors.

The WHOQOL-BREF guideline requires removing cases where the total number of items completed is less than 21. After deleting cases that lacked the required number of responses, 88 people remained for univariate analysis. Among the survey participants, all mean scores of the four elements were identified the high-level of quality of life (Physical: 17.53 (SD=1.88), Psychological: 16.70 (SD=1.79), Social: 15.45 (SD=2.33), and Environmental: 18.22 (SD=1.80). Pearson’s correlation indicated that the level of relationship with classmates and social elements of quality of life was slightly positively correlated to each other r=.293, p=.006.

For multiple regression, 86 people were included in the analysis due to missing cases in participants’ program experiences. According to the histograms and normal p-p plots of the regression standardized residual, each element was presented to be relatively close to a normal distribution. Multicollinearity was also tested. The values for Tolerance (higher than .60), Variance Inflation Factor (less than 2.0), and correlations between predictors (less than .70) supported that there was little to no multicollinearity in this data.

(Insert Table 3)
The Omnibus Test failed to reject the null hypothesis for two elements: physical (p=.087) and environmental (p=.103), indicating that participants’ class satisfaction and relationships with classmates and instructors do not explain variation in each of those dependent variables. However, 14.7% of the variance in the psychological element can be explained by the predictors and the model was statistically significant ($F_{3, 82}=4.704$, $p=.004$). Among the predictors, deeper relationships with classmates were positively associated with the psychological element of quality of life ($p<.001$), but relationships with instructors were negatively associated with the psychological element of quality of life ($p=.018$). Likely, the predictors reliably predict their social elements of quality of life and 11.4% of the variance in the social element scores has been explained by those three predictors ($F_{3, 82}=3.513$, $p=.019$). While relationships with classmates and the social element of quality of life were positive ($p=.004$), relationships with instructors and the social element of quality of life were negative ($p=.010$). The overall class satisfaction was positively associated with both psychological and social elements of quality of life, but that was not statistically significant ($p=.648$ and $p=.319$, respectively).

**Discussion**

**University-Based Lifelong learning as an Intergenerational Activity**

The study results suggest that a university-based lifelong learning program can provide a good environment for intergenerational activities. More than half of the participants said they decided to participate in the program because classes are offered at the university, and almost twice as many participants found the benefits of the program in building social networks with younger students, compared to expanding social networks with other participants in Program 60. Given that the majority of students are younger adults in the university community, the older participants are likely to interact with younger students.
Potential benefit from the intergenerational involvement includes active aging that optimizes opportunities and improved health and well-being (Butts & Chana, 2007; Strand, 2012). Although the participants’ relationships with classmates appeared to be weaker than that with instructors, the study findings indicated that the level of relationships that the participants had with classmates was positively related to social and psychological elements of their quality of life. Therefore, it is critical to find ways to intensify the interrelation between older participants and younger students. One of the intergenerational activities that university-based learning programs could highlight is intergenerational discussions. Through the intergenerational discussions, older adults have an opportunity to share their knowledge and wisdom with younger students. Their life experiences from previous employment or reflection on events from early childhood or adulthood are good examples that older participants can contribute to the discussion. This intergenerational discussion could motivate older and younger students to solidify meaningful connections with one another.

The frequent intergenerational engagement in university-based lifelong learning programs can also benefit younger populations. According to Allan and Johnson (2009), younger populations tend to have limited knowledge about older adults and have concerns about the aging process. Their misconceptions often result from the assumptions of older adults’ lack of independence or poor health conditions. Previous research has discussed that class activities can reduce stigma and discrimination against older adults as a result of intergenerational engagements. Cichy and Smith (2011) explained that college students who participated in intergenerational discussion groups as part of class activities presented positive changes in their perceptions about older adults.
Furthermore, instructors’ roles should be considered in order to enhance various aspects of intergenerational activities in the program. Although the study results surprisingly did not support the assumption that relationships with instructors are positively associated with psychological and social elements of quality of life, the average score of relationships with instructors was relatively high at 3.65 (SD=0.84) out of 5.00. The participants discussed that their instructors were willing to help with schoolwork and they made them feel comfortable sharing academic concerns.

Instructors may need to be educated about normative changes that occur with aging and how these impact the classroom experience of older students. Instructors having older students should understand their unique backgrounds or needs prior to the class and engage them in class discussions and other appropriate activities. Developing relationships with older students might be helpful in supporting the emotional and social needs of them. Older students should be encouraged to discuss their experiences and skills with instructors so that they can contribute to class contents. Lastly, social workers working at universities could support older adults’ unique experience during the program and provide community resources that help their continuing education and independent living. When school is equipped to provide the support system for older students, their experience in the program will be improved as a whole.

**Psychological and Social Benefits of the Program**

Lifelong learning programs promote older adults’ successful and healthy aging. As the study results showed, participants’ experiences in the program were associated with their psychological and social elements in quality of life. While older adults are learning, they may work out a way to deal with late-life difficulties and develop late-life adjustments (Roberson,
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2005). Moreover, participants can identify their own strengths and interests when they learn something in the participant’s desired way (Hammond, 2004b).

Program 60 allows participants to select classes that meet their learning needs and suit their interests. Therefore, Program 60 not only satisfies older adults’ learning needs but also supports the development of new knowledge and skills that they can utilize in their life. Lifelong educational opportunities allow older adults to develop themselves in a rapidly changing society, to promote resilience influenced by social networks in later life, and to enhance their ability to manage life events (Biggs, Carstensen, & Hogan, 2012; Merriam & Kee, 2014; Smith, & Hayslip Jr, 2012).

According to Meeks and Murrel (2001), higher educational achievement leads to lower levels of negative traits and higher life satisfaction. Also, some studies suggest that older adults’ ongoing social engagement results in increased life satisfaction and quality of life and decreased depression rates (Cacioppo, Hughes, Waite, Hawkley, & Thisted, 2006; Thompson & Heller, 1990; Victor, Scrambler, Bond, & Bowling, 2000). Furthermore, participation in lifelong learning programs enables older adults to increase the sense of belonging and social contacts that could prevent them from being socially isolated later in their life (Nicholson Jr., 2009). Particularly through the university-based lifelong learning program, older adults have the opportunity to increase their social network by meeting people from different age groups and accessing diverse community information.

Marginalized Older Adults

Older adults who are white / non-Hispanic, those who have higher educational background and higher annual income, and those who living with others were overrepresented among the survey participants. University-based lifelong learning programs should engage in
outreach to marginalized older adults, who may experience more significant benefits from such programs. In spite of the growing number of institutes for lifelong learning in the United States, those programs have tended to be irregular across the regions or individuals (Young & Rosenberg, 2006). In other countries, like Japan, efforts to develop lifelong learning are initiated from the government and their policies focus on the development of lifelong learning opportunities to the wide-range of people (Young & Rosenberg, 2006). Taking it as a lesson, the U.S. government should draw societal awareness and invest public dollars to open and inclusive learning opportunities for older adults.

The program should regularly identify gaps in participation and ensure equal access to this useful and meaningful program. With a partnership with community organizations, universities should understand barriers among non-participant older adults who may want to participate in the lifelong learning program. Using partnership, community organizations could help provide transportation for older adults who lack mobility. Conversely, some classes can be offered in the community, off from campus, in locations like a retirement center. In this way, marginalized older adults can have better opportunities to participate in the lifelong learning program. Students would learn more about practical knowledge by interacting with older adults.

Limitations

Participants’ quality of life was measured in four elements. The predictive relations of participants’ program experiences with physical and environmental elements were not examined because the study results did not reject the null. Also, the proportion of variance in psychosocial and social elements accounted for was relatively small. It is recommended that researchers utilize other measures such as Educational Motivation and Educational Barriers as a part of the Active Aging Measurement (Caro, Caspi, Burr, & Mutchler, 2005). Evaluating the program with other
measures may identify the benefits of the university-based lifelong learning program that more closely align with older adults’ successful and productive aging. Furthermore, a longitudinal assessment of the participants will be helpful to learn about long-term changes in the relationships between a university-based lifelong program and older adults’ quality of life over the time they participate in the program.

The results were based on data collected from a small number of participants in Program 60. Therefore, generalization of these findings should be carefully considered. The survey participation rate was around 37%, although the participants had access to the internet and the study was advertised beforehand. Nulty (2008) reviewed previous research to compare the response rates between paper-based and online-based course and teaching evaluation surveys. Nulty found that paper-based surveys resulted in higher response rates. For future research, therefore, it is encouraged to take face-to-face administration to collect a large sample size. Additionally, a qualitative approach using in-depth individual interviews should be used to develop a deeper understanding of older adults’ experiences in the university-based lifelong learning program and explore challenges and opportunities of their engagement.

**Conclusion**

The number of older adults is projected to grow significantly in the future. This demographic shift has produced some challenges for service providers and policy makers as well as individuals and family members. Therefore, community organizations have developed various programs to meet the increasing needs of older adults. Their unique needs include learning needs, and lifelong learning programs play an important role to satisfy their needs and improve their quality of life and health and well-being (Crimmins & Cambois, 2003; Findsen, 2006; Hammond, 2004a, 2004b; Mitchell, 2007; Narushima, 2008; Williamson, 1997). For these reasons, the Ohio
Department of Aging has supported 22 lifelong institutes that are community-based and 46 university- or college-based lifelong learning programs.

This study evaluated Program 60, one university-based lifelong learning program. This evaluation provided program development information and added evidence that the university-based lifelong learning program helps participants enhance psychological well-being and social networks, particularly with younger generations. University-based lifelong learning programs offer unique benefits for older adults because they can interact with younger students and utilize community resources provided on campus. Furthermore, community as well as individual well-being can be improved as older adults focus on their interests and actively engage in learning activities (Merriam & Kee, 2014).

Lifelong learning for older adults should not be separated from other support programs for older adults. Lifelong learning programs should highlight older adults’ capabilities and consider how to continue their engagement in community, while utilizing them. Lastly, the program should target outreach to older adults who are underserved in community. While realizing the equal opportunity to education in later life, older adults will age more successfully and productively.
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Table 1. Demographics of the Survey Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (m=67.97)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 and older</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / non-Hispanic</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married / Living with others</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single / Never been married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed / Separated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School / Some College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Degree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below $29,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $79,999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Participants’ Motivation and Perceived Benefits of the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation to Participate in the Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to develop my knowledge</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program is provided in university</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a free learning program</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to enjoy my life</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to make friends</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Benefits of the Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can learn new knowledge</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program improves my emotional satisfaction</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program improves my physical satisfaction</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can expand social network with younger generations</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can expand social network with other participants in the program</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Multiple Regression Testing Relationships between Participants’ Program Experiences and Quality of Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>SE of the Estimates</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>.147**</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>16.274***</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Satisfaction</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Classmates</td>
<td>.857***</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Instructors</td>
<td>-.679**</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.114**</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>15.265***</td>
<td>1.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Satisfaction</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Classmates</td>
<td>.891**</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Instructors</td>
<td>-.965**</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **$p < .05$; ***$p < .001$. 