

CONVERSION OF OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
RESIDENCE HALLS FOR RETIRED
PERSONNEL HOUSING

By

KATHRYN KINSTLE JOOS

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1975

SEP 12 1975

CONVERSION OF OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
RESIDENCE HALLS FOR RETIRED
PERSONNEL HOUSING

Thesis Approved:

Christine J. Salmon

Thesis Adviser

L. Kay Stewart

Florence D. Kinney

Rich Stinnett

N. N. Durbin

Dean of the Graduate College

916353

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to the members of my thesis committee: Mrs. Christine Salmon, my major adviser, for her active support of and participation in the proposal of this study; Dr. Florence McKinney, for her investment of time spent in the critical reading of this manuscript and for her guidance; Dr. Nick Stinnett and Dr. Kay Stewart, for their time involved in the critical reading of this thesis and for their helpful suggestions and guidance given in the area of data interpretation.

Great appreciation is expressed to Mr. Gene Turner, Mr. Norman Moore, Mrs. Iris McPherson and Mrs. Mildred Lee, without whose help this study would not have been possible.

Very special thanks go to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. R. Kinstle, who had the love to listen and understand during this period of graduate study.

A special portion of my thanks and appreciation goes also to my husband, Paul, for his patience, understanding, faith and encouragement throughout this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
Economic Situation	7
Housing Situation	9
Housing Alternatives	11
Needs of the Elderly	12
III. PROCEDURE	18
Selection of Subjects	18
Description of Instrument	19
Data Collection	19
Data Analysis	20
IV. RESULTS	23
Description of Subjects	23
Examination of Major Purpose	26
Examination of Specific Purposes	26
V. SUMMARY	43
Conclusions and Recommendations	45
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	48
APPENDIX - QUESTIONNAIRE	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristics of the Subjects	24
II. Desire of Retirees and Future Retirees for Living in a Converted Residence Hall Retirement Complex	26
III. Desire for Living in a Converted Residence Hall Retirement Complex in Relation to Retirement Status	27
IV. Desire of Males and Females for Living in a Converted Residence Hall Retirement Complex	28
V. Desire for Living in a Converted Residence Hall Retirement Complex in Relation to Present Living Status	29
VI. Preferences for Services Within or Near the Retirement Complex	30
VII. Preferences of Males and Females for Services Within or Near the Retirement Complex	31
VIII. Preferences for Indoor Recreational Facilities	32
IX. Preferences for Outdoor Recreational Facilities	33
X. Preferences of Males and Females for Indoor Recreational Facilities	34
XI. Preferences of Males and Females for Outdoor Recreational Facilities	35
XII. Preference for a Communal Dining Area Within the Complex	36
XIII. Preference for Number of Bedrooms	37
XIV. Approximate Year When Interested Respondents Would Consider Moving Into the Complex	38
XV. Tenure Preferences of Respondents	38
XVI. Approximate Preferred Housing Costs: Total Cost of Dwelling for Respondents Desiring to Own Their Living Unit	39

Table	Page
XVII. Approximate Preferred Housing Costs: Total Monthly Cost (Including Utilities) of Dwelling for Respondents Desiring to Rent Their Living Unit	40
XVIII. Desire of Retired Persons for Living in a Retirement Complex in Relation to Occupational Class	41
XIX. Desire of Persons Retiring Within Five Years for Living in a Retirement Complex in Relation to Occupational Class	41
XX. Desire of Persons Retiring Within Ten Years for Living in a Retirement Complex in Relation to Occupational Class	42

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

Persons 65 and older constitute one of the most rapidly growing segments of the American population. On a national level, the year 1900 shows that there were nearly three million persons aged 65 and over, representing 7.3 percent of a total population of 76 million; by 1970, the elderly population had increased to 20 million and represented ten percent of a total population of 203 million (Broom, 1972; Eisdorfer, 1971). Thus, during this 70-year period, the elderly population was increasing at a rate of about three times more than the growth of the overall population (Eisdorfer, 1971).

In Oklahoma, the rapid increase of numbers of elderly persons is evidenced within the past few years. According to the 1970 census, there were 299,756 persons aged 65 and over in the state (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1973). By 1972, this elderly population had grown to an estimated 314,000 persons (U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1973).

In Stillwater, the increase of elderly persons within the last ten years is worth noting. In 1960, the elderly population in the Stillwater area alone numbered 1,572 persons (City of Stillwater, 1973). The U. S. Bureau of the Census (1973) revealed that in 1970, there were

2,023 persons over 65 years of age, representing seven percent of the total city population, which is slightly lower than the national percentage. However, Broom (1972) suggested that this lower percentage could be misleading because of the large number of persons between ages 18 and 25 attending the university. By 1980, it is roughly estimated that elderly persons in the Stillwater area will number 2,392 or over (City of Stillwater, 1973).

Housing is a basic need of all persons, in all age groups. However, numerous physiological and sociological changes which occur during the later years of life make the need for suitable housing a crucial problem for persons in the 65 and over age group. Idealistically, enough housing choices would be available to meet the varied needs of a diversified elderly population. Of course, this ideal situation is difficult to find, especially in small communities.

Housing for the elderly in Stillwater, although better than in some small towns, is still less than desirable, mainly because of the lack of a variety of housing alternatives. The Stillwater area is serviced by four nursing homes, one of which cares exclusively for psychiatric and mentally retarded patients. A very high majority of the patients in the remaining three nursing homes, either because of failing health or senility, require medical care and supervision to the extent that it would be difficult to adequately meet their needs in a residential home situation, regardless of whether the patient was living alone or with someone (Pryce, 1974). The only other housing arrangement offered in Stillwater for elderly persons is on an individual home-ownership or rental basis. Oklahoma City, approximately 65 miles southwest of Stillwater, is the closest community that offers a

variety of housing arrangements to meet the various needs of elderly persons.

Obviously there is a large void in the alternatives offered to the elderly population in the Stillwater area. Full care institutions are necessary for persons who are unable to care for themselves; nationally, less than four percent of persons 65 or over live in institutions and of this percentage, most are in nursing homes and personal care homes (Atchley, 1972). But the Stillwater area offers no housing accommodations for the majority of elderly persons who require only limited supervision and assistance and who, while either unable or unwilling to absorb the responsibilities of maintaining a home (such as maintenance, repairs, and yard work), still wish to be independent as long as possible. There is a need for more living alternatives to be provided for the older population in Stillwater.

Stillwater, being a university community, has resources which could be employed to improve the housing situation for elderly persons. Because of an expanding campus and because more students at Oklahoma State University are finding living accommodations off campus, it has been indicated that several residence halls will be vacated in the near future. Combined cooperation between university and community resources could result in the design of a retirement living facility which could meet the physical and social needs of a segment of the town's elderly population.

The structure of these residence halls is such that the architectural features could be remodeled into efficiency, one bedroom and possibly two bedroom apartments with the specially designed features such as hand grips near tubs and showers, wide door openings and lower

cabinet areas, which are frequently necessary in the living quarters of older persons. Small kitchen areas and living areas could be available in some of the apartments, depending upon size and floor plan. The already-existing large living rooms, porches and yard spaces of these residence halls plus the convenience of near-by lighted parking facilities have excellent potential for conversion to a retirement living complex. Most of these residence halls have laundry provisions within the building as well as additional recreational spaces.

The university campus offers year-round diversified activities such as sporting events, educational classes and theatrical presentations. For those persons not desiring to participate in campus activities, the Stillwater community also offers a variety of other activities. Any of the available residence halls which might be converted to a living complex of this type would be conveniently located to campus and community services, the downtown area and to Stillwater's medical services which are located several blocks south of the campus.

Although elderly persons would occupy the living complex itself, the complex would be located on the campus proper where an age-integrated environment would exist. Such an environment could be a great asset in meeting the needs of the elderly, middle-aged and the younger generations. The scope of education on the Oklahoma State University campus would be broadened considerably by interaction of students and staff with the residents of the retirement living complex.

Although utilizing residence hall space for the elderly is a relatively new concept in retirement housing, the advantages of using these vacant residence halls in this way are numerous. Perhaps, as Havighurst (1969) suggested, the failure to design and build purely

experimental housing units is the most serious shortcoming in housing research. Without experimentation, it is impossible to know what constitutes a successful project and what does not. An experimental project of this type would be beneficial to both the Oklahoma State University campus and the Stillwater community in that it would:

1. provide an alternative choice in retirement living accommodations to the community;
2. give an alternative which perhaps would encourage retiring persons to remain in the Stillwater area;
3. eliminate wasted space by utilizing residence halls on campus;
4. expand the educational program of the university;
5. promote interpersonal activities and understanding among several generations of people;
6. advance housing research concerning a relatively new concept in retirement living accommodations which would be adaptable to various situations.

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study was to examine the interest of Oklahoma State University retirees, present and future, in converting residence halls on the Oklahoma State University campus into retirement living complexes, as the first step in establishing the feasibility of such a concept.

The specific purposes of this study were:

1. To compare the interest within groups of retired persons and future retirees in living in a residence hall which has been

converted into a retirement living complex.

2. To identify preferences for services within or near the retirement living complex area and determine whether preferences differ according to sex.
3. To identify preferences for both indoor and outdoor recreational facilities and determine whether preferences differ according to sex.
4. To identify preferences for two architectural features: (a) a communal dining area within the housing complex, (b) number of bedrooms.
5. To identify an approximate year when interested retirees and future retirees would consider moving into such a living complex.
6. To identify tenure preferences and to identify approximate preferred housing costs: (a) total cost of dwelling for owners, (b) monthly cost for renters.
7. To determine if the interest in living in such a retirement living complex varies according to occupational class: (a) salaried-academic, (b) salaried non-academic, (c) wage non-academic.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Since very little literature exists concerning the conversion of vacant residence halls into retirement living complexes, the following is a selected review of research and ideas concerning general characteristics of aging persons in relation to: (a) their economic situation, (b) their housing situation, (c) their housing alternatives, and (d) needs of elderly persons in relation to housing.

Economic Situation

With reduced fixed incomes as well as continuously decreasing living space, suitable housing environments become an important need of older persons. However, the economic situation of elderly persons frequently forces them to accept less than satisfactory housing conditions often located in the most economically-depressed areas of the cities (Montgomery, 1972; Atchley, 1972).

Atchley (1972) reported that about two-thirds of working adults expected no financial troubles during retirement, even though the majority expected their retirement incomes to decrease by 50 percent from their pre-retirement incomes. However, Atchley's report may be slightly misleading without actual income figures. Montgomery (1972, p. 38) stated: "the 1969 median income of aged families was less than half that of all families." A continuation of his report revealed that

\$4,952 was the median income of older white families and \$3,045 was the median income of older Negro families. In contrast, \$10,085 was the median income of all families with heads under 65. About one quarter of elderly persons live below the poverty level (Montgomery, 1972; Kreps, 1971). Wilner and Walkley (1966) stated that this lower economic situation which affects older persons is due to several factors:

1. withdrawal from the labor force;
2. increasing personal expenses with a fixed income;
3. lack of credit extended to elderly persons.

Perhaps the withdrawal from the labor force is the strongest contributing factor to this reduction in income during later years. Before the twentieth century, people were not forced to retire at a certain age; however, with an expanding population and competition in the labor force from younger persons, there seems to be more pressure applied for required early retirement without regard to the abilities of the older workers for successfully accomplishing tasks (Kreps, 1971; Schulz, 1973). Kreps (1971) reinforced this by stating that at the beginning of the century, two out of three men aged 65 or over were employed whereas in 1970, only one in four was in the labor force.

Loether (1967) suggested several reasons for this withdrawal from the labor force with advancing age:

1. Poor health and physical disabilities which accompany later years force people into terminating their employment.
2. Obsolescence of skills is a result of changing technology.
3. Continued progress of automation permanently displaces older workers from obsolete jobs.

4. Mechanization of farming, which was a major source of income for many older workers, forces people to quit work.
5. Older workers generally have less formal education than their younger competitors.
6. Plant relocation frequently forces older workers to withdraw from the work force, as they are less mobile than younger people.
7. Compulsory retirement policies are a growing tendency among industries, companies and governments.
8. Some persons look forward to retirement.

Housing Situation

With the problems of lower fixed incomes as a result of unemployment, whether by choice or force, the housing situation for the elderly is less than desirable. Montgomery (1972) indicated that the elderly placed importance on decent housing conditions because a larger percentage of their income was spent on housing. Beyer (1965) and Loether (1967) further emphasized the importance of adequate living accommodations with several reasons:

1. the large and increasing elderly population;
2. more time spent at home;
3. social isolation of the elderly.

Even though most elderly persons live in houses, flats or apartments, many of these dwellings are substandard, as Oriol (1971) reinforced by his estimation that more than six million elderly Americans live in substandard housing.

Beyer (1965, 1961) and Spector (1964) reported the following:

1. About four out of five, or 80 percent, of the units occupied by the elderly were built before 1932.
2. About two out of five, or 40 percent, of the units were built before 1910.
3. In 1960, 75 percent of the elderly lived in dwellings built before 1939, while six percent lived in structures built after 1955.

Some general characteristics of housing units occupied by elderly persons are:

1. too large in relation to amount of living space needed;
2. older dwellings;
3. frequently located in older neighborhoods;
4. frequently below minimum standard housing requirements;
5. in need of maintenance and repairs;
6. lacking basic facilities such as plumbing and heating;
7. poorer housing contributing to poorer health (Beyer, 1961;

Hoppis, 1973; Montgomery, 1972; National Council on the Aging, 1970; Shanas, 1969; Tucson Community Council on the Aged, 1960).

In a report by Hoppis (1973), Oklahoma's elderly expressed the following problems concerning their housing situation:

1. inadequate public housing facilities, all of which have waiting lists;
2. high cost of property taxes, resulting in difficulties in home ownership;
3. the need for home maintenance and repair services.

In summary of the previous data, it is indicated that the housing situation of the elderly is indeed serious and that steps should be

taken to provide acceptable housing at prices they can afford.

Housing Alternatives

Some of the housing choices for older persons are: (a) continue to live in their own homes but neglect home maintenance; (b) rent sub-standard housing; (c) live in government-subsidized dwellings; (d) live in the home of children or relatives; and (e) live independently in either a planned or unplanned setting (Merkin, 1971; Montgomery, 1972; Shanas, 1969).

Heusinkveld (1968) listed some of the types of housing available for older persons who are in good health as:

1. independent home ownership or rental;
2. congregate housing facilities providing food and maid service, some health care and activities programs;
3. housekeeping apartments or cottages providing independent living within a group situation;
4. composite types of projects combining congregate residences and housekeeping apartments or cottages;
5. private enterprise villages with mobile home parks a modification;
6. converted hotels;
7. public housing.

Merkin (1971), Montgomery (1972), and Shanas (1969) reported that nursing homes, extended care units and hospitals are the alternatives for persons in poor health or who require professional supervision.

In a report by Keeler (1973), it was stated that all too frequently, many elderly and handicapped persons who do not need medical help

or supervision are living in nursing homes and other institutions simply because the communities lack a variety of needed housing alternatives. She suggested that an unnecessary lengthy stay in nursing homes or institutions such as this often makes it difficult and sometimes impossible to return to the person's own home.

In his study of the elderly, Beckman (1969) found that congregate life in a retirement village seemed to be more acceptable to those persons who were in occupations involving group and human relations.

Needs of the Elderly

Montgomery (1972) listed the following as fundamental needs of the elderly; all are relevant to the housing environment:

1. independence -- provision of physical features which enables each person to maintain his own household;
2. safety and comfort -- provision of security and comfort by the use of "defensible" space such as public space, semi-public space, private space, and semi-private space;
3. wholesome self-concept -- provision of decent and quality housing which contributes to a feeling of self-respect and dignity;
4. sense of place -- provision of an environment that promotes a feeling of identification with familiar surroundings in which recognition of a place in society is felt because of a sense of contribution;
5. relatedness -- provision of an atmosphere in which residents can relate and interact with one another, their immediate families, their friends, and their community;

6. environmental mastery -- provision of an environment over which individuals are able to exercise some measure of control;
7. psychological stimulation -- provision of surroundings in which a variety of stimuli are present;
8. privacy -- provision of an environment which meets the need of privacy in both an auditory and visual manner.

Loring (1961) stated that privacy encompasses two types of behavior: (a) visual and audial privacy from other residents in the dwelling and (b) privacy from the outside world.

Data collected in a study by Hamovitch and Peterson (1969) revealed other desires of the elderly as:

1. location in a pleasant climate;
2. location near shopping and laundry facilities, medical and religious personnel;
3. location near children, other relatives and friends;
4. location among persons of similar age with some younger persons near by;
5. location among persons of the same economic, social and cultural class but with a mixture of religious preferences;
6. location near public transportation or freeways;
7. safety of homes.

In an article prepared by Harvest Years (1970), it was suggested that the retirement dwelling, as well as the living environment, should: (a) be inviting to family and friends; (b) provide spiritual, mental and physical stimulation; (c) accommodate the physical capacity to function; (d) promote a sense of pride; (e) provide access to

recreational, cultural and work opportunities; and (f) provide easy access to necessary health services.

Whether the homes for the aged be nursing homes or types of congregate living arrangements, opportunities should be provided for every resident to live to his fullest capacity. The setting should be home-like and encourage optimism and a sense of pride and dignity. The setting should also be easily accessible for residents, family, friends, administrators and staff as well as be conveniently located to a variety of community services. The total living environment should provide for the opportunity of living without a feeling of isolation (Randall, 1956).

A major controversial aspect in the realm of elderly housing is whether or not to provide age-segregated or age-integrated housing. As would be expected, there are advantages and disadvantages to each alternative. Age-integration with younger persons could prevent development of special interest areas as well as de-emphasize some of the problems of aging. However, age-integrated housing may be a solution in meeting the social and psychological needs of the elderly by expanding social interaction and thus enlarging the scope of friends and support. In an age-segregated environment, elderly persons may be more sensitive to their own ills and problems because of the close proximity of illness and death (Walkley, Mangum, Sherman, Dodds, and Wilner, 1966).

Data collected by Carp (1965, 1966) from residents in Victoria Plaza in San Antonio, Texas, revealed that an age-segregated living environment promoted social involvement as well as improved morale and self image.

Sanderson (1971) supported the concept of inter-generational housing in her report about the age-integrated, high-rise complex area located on the campus of Syracuse University. Adjacent to Toomey Abbott Towers, a complex for elderly persons, are two residence halls which house about 700 undergraduate students. Sanderson found that as a result of this age mixture, the elderly persons took part in educational, recreational and cultural facilities on the campus. As the two groups became acquainted, shared values, interests and mutual learning developed. Social events and mutual services merged the two groups into one enriched community of people.

Mumford (1956) advocated age-integration rather than age-segregation for the continuation of a fulfilled life. Grant (1970) further suggested that the ideal situation would be an age-segregated immediate housing environment within close proximity of other various age groups so that age mixing on a social level would be available when and if desired.

Concerning the spaces which should be available within the housing environment, Loring (1961) suggested: (a) circulation spaces for casual contact; (b) outdoor social areas with spaces for recreation or quiet privacy; (c) indoor social areas with spaces for entertainment interaction; and (d) spaces for functional services.

Loether (1967) recommended the following design features as desirable in the construction of elderly housing:

1. adequate system of temperature and climate control;
2. adequate source of both sunlight and artificial light;
3. adequate control of sound and noise;

4. provision for the maximum conservation of energy and minimization of the necessity for reaching, lifting, bending, pulling, and climbing;
5. architectural safety factors.

Focusing the housing needs at the local level, the following are recommendations suggested by elderly Oklahomans which would help in meeting the needs of their housing situation:

1. reduction of housing costs to elderly by: (a) more liberalized eligibility limitations; (b) instituting rent control in non-public housing; and (c) exemption from property and school taxes;
2. provision of additional housing for low and moderate income persons with special consideration given to: (a) variety of types; (b) convenience of location; (c) inclusion of design features and special equipment needed by elderly persons; and (d) incorporation of multi-purpose facilities and services;
3. improvement of existing housing facilities;
4. provision of an information center or other publicity on available housing for the elderly;
5. opportunities for varied housing options for congregate cooking and proximity to different age groups for social interaction;
6. improvement of nursing home facilities with lower rates, variety in diets, insurance of the preservation of dignity and privacy;
7. provision of foster homes for elderly with special needs;

8. provision of home maintenance services or maintenance allowances for recipients of public assistance (Department of Health Studies, University of Oklahoma, 1971).

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

The subjects for this study consisted of 233 men and women living in the Stillwater area. Since the conversion of a residence hall into a retirement living complex is presently under consideration on the Oklahoma State University campus, all subjects were either current or former employees of Oklahoma State University.

Because many persons do not seriously consider retirement living conditions until they are relatively close to retirement themselves, all subjects of this study were either already retired or approaching retirement within ten years. Subjects were divided into three chronological categories:

- a. those already retired;
- b. those eligible for retirement within five years (1973-1978);
and
- c. those eligible for retirement within ten years (1978-1983).

All persons who met the above criteria according to the records of the Oklahoma State University personnel office were included in the sample. Within each of the retirement status categories previously mentioned, subjects were subdivided into the following employment divisions:

- a. salaried-academic;

- b. salaried non-academic;
- c. wage non-academic.

Description of Instrument

The questionnaire (see Appendix) was developed by the author for the purpose of examining the interest of Oklahoma State University retirees and future retirees for living in a residence hall which has been converted into a retirement living complex. The questionnaire was composed of fixed alternative type questions designed to obtain the following information:

- a. general background information such as sex, age, race, marital status, health rating, education, employment status and present living situations and environment;
- b. attitudes and preferences of desired living environments in retirement years;
- c. financial status in relation to retirement years.

The instrument was pre-tested on a small group of persons over 50 years of age. Minor alterations and additions were made to the questionnaire following this pre-test.

Data Collection

In November, 1973, questionnaires were mailed to 479 persons. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter explaining the research and assuring anonymity. In the event that both husband and wife were employed by Oklahoma State University, only one questionnaire was sent to the head of the household. Of the 479 questionnaires mailed out, 249 questionnaires were returned. Sixteen of those were

eliminated because of the following reasons:

- a. one subject was on sabbatical leave;
- b. two subjects were deceased;
- c. three subjects had moved from the area and no forwarding addresses were known;
- d. three subjects were no longer employed by Oklahoma State University;
- e. seven questionnaires were returned blank.

A total of 233 subjects were used in the final analysis.

Data Analysis

The dependent variables in this study were:

- a. interest expressed for living in a residence hall which has been converted into a retirement complex as measured by question 21 (see Appendix for references to all questions);
- b. services desired within or near the retirement complex, as measured by question 24;
- c. indoor recreational facilities desired, as measured by question 30;
- d. outdoor recreational facilities desired, as measured by question 29.

The independent variables in this study were:

- a. retirement status as measured by personnel records;
- b. occupational status, as measured by personnel records;
- c. sex, as measured by question 4;
- d. present living status, as measured by question 14.

Frequency and percentage distributions were used to analyze the background characteristics of the subjects as well as to examine the following purposes:

1. To examine the interest of Oklahoma State University retirees, present and future, in converting residence halls on the Oklahoma State University campus into retirement living complexes.
2. To identify preferences for services within or near the retirement living complex area and determine whether preferences differ according to sex.
3. To identify preferences for both indoor and outdoor recreational facilities and determine whether preferences differ according to sex.
4. To identify preferences for two architectural features: (a) a communal dining area within the housing complex, (b) number of bedrooms.
5. To identify an approximate year when interested retirees and future retirees would consider moving into such a living complex.
6. To identify tenure preferences and to identify approximate preferred housing costs: (a) total cost of dwelling for owners; and (b) monthly cost for renters.

The chi-square test was used to examine the following purposes:

1. To compare the interest expressed by groups of retired persons and future retirees in living in a residence hall that has been converted into a retirement living complex.

2. To determine if the interest in living in such a retirement complex varies according to occupational class: (a) salaried-academic; (b) salaried non-academic; and (c) wage non-academic.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

A detailed description of the 233 subjects who participated in this study is presented in Table I. The sample consisted of 70 percent males and 30 percent females. The ages of the respondents ranged from 50 to 74 years of age with the largest percentages in the 55-59 age range (42%) and the 60-64 age range (30%). Less than one percent of the respondents were non white. A majority of the respondents were currently married (75%). Concerning health, over 57 percent reported their health to be good and nearly 30 percent considered themselves to be in excellent health.

Of all respondents, 32 percent had the doctorate degree, while 26 percent had the masters degree and 15 percent had the bachelors degree. The majority of respondents (74%) were not retired at the time the questionnaire was answered. Most respondents (69%) were employed full time.

Within each of the three retirement status categories, the following percentages were those in the salaried-academic category:

1. already retired, 59 percent;
2. retiring within five years, 50 percent; and
3. retiring within ten years, 48 percent.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Characteristics	Number	Percent
Sex	N=233	
Male	163	69.96
Female	70	30.04
Age	N=233	
50-54	4	1.72
55-59	97	41.63
60-64	69	29.61
65-69	52	22.32
70-74	11	4.72
Race	N=233	
White	232	99.57
Indian	1	.43
Marital Status	N=210	
Married	175	75.11
Single	23	9.87
Widow	19	8.15
Widower	4	1.72
Divorced	12	5.15
Health	N=233	
Poor	2	.86
Fair	30	12.88
Good	133	57.08
Excellent	68	29.18
Education	N=231	
Grammar school	14	6.06
Some high school	6	2.60
High school graduate	16	6.93
Some college	27	11.69
College graduate	34	14.72
Masters degree	61	26.41
Doctorate degree	73	31.60
Presently Retired	N=231	
Yes	61	26.41
No	170	73.59

TABLE I (Continued)

Characteristics	Number	Percent
Employment Status	N=225	
Not retired:		
Unemployed	9	4.00
Part-time	6	2.67
Full-time	155	68.89
Retired:		
Not employed	35	15.56
Part-time	14	6.22
Full-time	6	2.67
Retirement Status		
Already retired:	N=51	
Salaried-academic	30	58.82
Salaried non-academic	17	33.33
Wage non-academic	4	7.84
Retiring within five years:	N=74	
Salaried-academic	37	50.00
Salaried non-academic	24	32.43
Wage non-academic	13	17.57
Retiring within ten years:	N=106	
Salaried-academic	51	48.11
Salaried non-academic	49	46.23
Wage non-academic	6	5.66
Present Living Arrangement	N=226	
Lives alone	46	20.35
Lives with spouse	170	75.22
Lives with children, relatives, or friends	10	4.42
Type of Dwelling	N=225	
Single family	212	94.22
Duplex	4	1.78
Apartment	3	1.33
Mobile home	2	.89
Other	4	1.78
Housing Tenure	N=225	
Rent	14	6.22
Own	210	93.33
Pay no rent or rent free	1	.44

The largest percentage of respondents lived with their spouse (75%). Most of the respondents lived in single family dwellings (94%) and more than 90 percent of respondents owned their dwellings.

Examination of Major Purpose

Major Purpose. To examine the interest of Oklahoma State University retirees, present and future, in converting residence halls on the Oklahoma State University campus into retirement living complexes.

Table II shows that 54 percent of all respondents expressed a desire to live in a residence hall which has been converted into a retirement living complex.

TABLE II
DESIRE OF RETIREES AND FUTURE RETIREES FOR LIVING
IN A CONVERTED RESIDENCE HALL
RETIREMENT COMPLEX

Desire	Number	Percent
Yes	121	53.54
No	105	46.46

Examination of Specific Purposes

Purpose (1). To compare the interest within groups of retired persons and future retirees in living in a residence hall that has been

converted into a retirement living complex.

Table III shows that about 55 percent of both retirees and future retirees expressed positive interest in living in a residence hall which has been converted into a retirement complex. However, there was no significant difference between the two groups, retirees and future retirees, with regard to their desire to live in such a complex.

TABLE III
DESIRE FOR LIVING IN A CONVERTED RESIDENCE HALL
RETIREMENT COMPLEX IN RELATION TO
RETIREMENT STATUS

Desire	Retirees		Future Retirees		X ²	Level of Sig.
	No.	%	No.	%		
Yes	32	55	89	54	.042	NS
No	26	45	77	46		

An additional test was run to determine whether desire to live in the complex differed according to sex of respondent. As Table IV indicates, a significant difference was found ($p < .001$). More than twice as many males (56%) as females (25%) reported they were not interested in living in a residence hall which has been converted into a retirement complex. A greater proportion of females (75%) than males (44%) indicated that they were interested in living in such a complex.

One explanation for the difference between males and females might be the difference in their life-expectancies. On the average, women live about five years longer than men, which increases the possibilities that the last few years of a woman's life will be spent in widowhood (Loether, 1967). Thus, women who anticipate living alone might prefer to live in a retirement complex, should a desirable complex be available.

TABLE IV
DESIRE OF MALES AND FEMALES FOR LIVING IN A CONVERTED
RESIDENCE HALL RETIREMENT COMPLEX

Desire	Males		Females		X ²	Level of Sig.
	No.	%	No.	%		
Yes	69	44	52	75	19.02	.001
No	88	56	17	25		

Table V reveals that there was a significant difference ($p < .001$) in the desire for living in a retirement complex according to the respondents' current living status. A larger proportion of persons living alone (82%) expressed a desire to live in the retirement complex, while a much smaller proportion of persons living with spouse or others expressed this desire. Possibly those persons living alone

would prefer the social interaction and companionship available in a retirement complex. A relief from the upkeep and maintenance responsibilities necessary in home-ownership may also be welcomed by some persons who live alone. Convenience to services such as laundry, medical, shopping, and recreational facilities may also explain why more persons who live alone would prefer to live in a retirement living complex.

TABLE V
 DESIRE FOR LIVING IN A CONVERTED RESIDENCE HALL
 RETIREMENT COMPLEX IN RELATION TO
 PRESENT LIVING STATUS*

Desire	<u>Live Alone</u>		<u>Live With Spouse or With Others</u>		X ²	Level of Sig.
	No.	%	No.	%		
Yes	36	82	80	46	18.40	.001
No	8	18	95	54		

* Categories live with spouse and live with friends, relatives or children were combined due to an insufficient number of cases to analyze separately.

Purpose (2). To identify preferences for services within or near the retirement living complex area and determine whether preferences differ according to sex.

One hundred and eighty-five persons indicated a desire for at least one service and of those 185 persons, some indicated a desire

for more than one service. Table VI shows that the most preferred services within or near the retirement complex were: (a) laundry facilities (91%); (b) parking space for cars (91%); (c) restaurant services (72%); and (d) drug store services (70%). There were over 19 percent of the respondents who desired services other than those listed on the questionnaire. Some of those additional services included: (a) recreational facilities; (b) activity areas for arts, crafts, hobbies and workshops; (c) transportation services; (d) churches; and (e) club and meeting rooms.

TABLE VI
PREFERENCES FOR SERVICES WITHIN OR NEAR
THE RETIREMENT COMPLEX

Service	Number	Percent*
	N=185	
Laundry	168	90.81
Parking for Car	168	90.81
Restaurant	134	72.43
Shopping	123	66.49
Library	122	65.95
Medical Clinic	119	64.32
Drug Store	130	70.27
OSU Activities	108	58.38
Others	36	19.46

* Percentages do not total to 100 percent since respondents could indicate their preferences for more than one service.

As Table VII reveals, there was only a slight difference of preferences for services according to sex of respondent. Among 120 male respondents, a slightly larger proportion (93%) rated parking space for cars as first preference and laundry facilities as second preference (91%). The reverse is reported among the 65 female respondents, with laundry facilities being first preference (91%) and parking space for cars being second choice (88%). Concerning the remaining services, both males and females reported very similar preferences.

TABLE VII
PREFERENCES OF MALES AND FEMALES FOR SERVICES
WITHIN OR NEAR THE RETIREMENT COMPLEX

Service	Males		Females	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent*
	N=120		N=65	
Laundry	109	90.83	59	90.77
Parking for Car	111	92.50	57	87.69
Restaurant	84	70.00	50	76.92
Shopping	81	67.50	42	64.62
Library	80	66.67	42	64.62
Medical Clinic	80	66.67	39	60.00
Drug Store	84	70.00	46	70.77
OSU Activities	69	57.50	39	60.00
Others	18	15.00	18	27.69

* Percentages do not total to 100 percent since respondents could indicate preferences for more than one service.

Purpose (3). To identify preferences for both indoor and outdoor recreational facilities and determine whether preferences differ according to sex.

As in previous cases, 184 persons indicated a desire for at least one indoor recreational facility and of these 184 persons, some indicated a desire for more than one facility. Table VIII reveals that the most preferred indoor recreational facility was reading rooms (65%), with an arts and crafts area (64%) and a communal living room and lounge area (58%) also desired. A few respondents added other recreational facilities to the list. Those facilities included: (a) space for showing movies; (b) hobby areas and workshops; (c) elevators; and (d) indoor swimming pool.

TABLE VIII
PREFERENCES FOR INDOOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Facility	Number	Percent*
	N=184	
Dominoes/Card Games	86	46.74
Reading Rooms	120	65.22
Meeting Rooms	79	42.93
Communal Living Room and Lounge Area	106	57.61
Men's Exercise Room	97	52.72
Women's Exercise Room	70	38.04
Arts and Crafts Area	117	63.59
Adult Education Classes	99	53.80
Others	11	5.98

* Percentages do not total to 100 percent since respondents could indicate preferences for more than one facility.

Table IX indicates that good lighting at night (75%) was of high importance to the 179 persons responding to the question regarding outdoor facilities. Benches (62%), covered walkways (52%) and a picnic area (49%) were other preferred outdoor recreational facilities. Additional outdoor facilities listed were: (a) golf; (b) swimming; (c) shaded landscaped areas for walking and sitting in privacy; and (d) tennis.

TABLE IX
PREFERENCES FOR OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Facility	Number	Percent*
	N=179	
Residents' Own Garden Area	83	46.37
Covered Walkways	93	51.96
Benches	111	62.01
Good Lighting at Night	135	75.42
Horseshoes, Shuffleboard, or Croquet	61	34.08
Picnic Area	87	48.60
Others	31	17.32

* Percentages do not total to 100 percent since respondents could indicate preferences for more than one facility.

Table X indicates that preferences for indoor recreational facilities differed according to sex of respondent. Among the 123 males who responded to the question, the most desired indoor facility was a men's exercise room (75%); reading rooms (67%), communal living room and

lounge area (59%) and arts and crafts areas (58%) were other preferred facilities. Of the 61 female respondents, an arts and crafts area was a very important facility (75%); adult education classes (71%) and reading rooms (62%) were other preferred indoor facilities.

TABLE X
PREFERENCES OF MALES AND FEMALES FOR
INDOOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Facility	Males		Females	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent*
	N=123		N=61	
Dominoes/Card Games	59	47.97	27	44.26
Reading Rooms	82	66.67	38	62.30
Meeting Rooms	50	40.65	29	47.54
Communal Living Room and Lounge Area	73	59.35	33	54.10
Men's Exercise Room	92	74.80	5	8.20
Women's Exercise Room	34	27.64	36	59.02
Arts and Crafts Area	71	57.72	46	75.41
Adult Education Classes	56	45.53	43	70.50
Others	6	4.89	5	8.20

* Percentages do not total to 100 percent since respondents could indicate preferences for more than one facility.

A possible explanation for this difference might be that generally, men are thought to be more athletic than women. This may explain why such a large proportion of males expressed a desire for men's exercise room. An arts and crafts area may be highly important to women

because hobbies such as decoupage, tole painting, ceramics, etc. are frequently pursued by numbers of women. Because a number of females in the sample were secretaries, food service workers and housekeepers, they may have less formal education than those with the highest degrees. This fact may account for their interest in continuing their education through adult education classes.

Table XI reveals that three outdoor recreational facilities were greatly preferred by both sexes. Good lighting at night was reported to be the most important facility by men (71%) and women (84%). Availability of benches near the complex area was also important to males (62%) and females (62%). Also, a desire was expressed by both sexes (men - 49%; women - 57%) for covered walkways to be incorporated into the surrounding complex area.

TABLE XI
PREFERENCES OF MALES AND FEMALES FOR OUTDOOR
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Facility	Males		Females	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent*
	N=118		N=61	
Residents' Own Garden Area	53	44.92	30	49.18
Covered Walkways	58	49.15	35	57.38
Benches	73	61.86	38	62.30
Good Lighting at Night	84	71.19	51	83.61
Horsehoes, Shuffleboard, or Croquet	47	39.83	14	22.96
Picnic Area	54	45.76	33	24.10
Others	18	15.25	13	21.31

* Percentages do not total to 100 percent since respondents could indicate preferences for more than one facility.

Purpose (4). To identify preferences for two architectural features:
(a) a communal dining area within the housing complex and (b) number of
bedrooms.

As Table XII illustrates, a high percentage of the responses (81%) indicated a desire for a communal dining area in addition to kitchen-dining areas within each apartment.

TABLE XII
 PREFERENCE FOR A COMMUNAL DINING AREA
 WITHIN THE COMPLEX

Preference	Number	Percent
Yes	149	80.54
No	36	19.46

Table XIII indicates that 60 percent of the respondents preferred a two-bedroom apartment. There was little interest expressed (8%) in a combination living-bedroom arrangement.

TABLE XIII
PREFERENCE FOR NUMBER OF BEDROOMS

Number of Bedrooms	Number	Percent
Living Room-Bedroom Combination	14	7.57
One Bedroom	60	32.43
Two Bedroom	111	60.00

Purpose (5). To identify an approximate year when interested retirees and future retirees would consider moving into such a living complex.

Table XIV indicates that within the five-year period, 1975-1979, there were 48 respondents who would consider moving into the complex. Within the next five-year period, 1980-1985, there were 49 respondents who would consider moving into the complex. The year 1978 showed 17 persons, or 15 percent of the respondents, as the most likely year for increased interest in occupancy.

TABLE XIV
 APPROXIMATE YEAR WHEN INTERESTED RESPONDENTS
 WOULD CONSIDER MOVING INTO THE COMPLEX

Year	Number	Percent
1974	3	2.63
1975	8	7.03
1976	6	5.26
1977	7	6.14
1978	17	14.91
1979	10	8.77
1980-1985	49	42.98
1986-1990	14	12.28

Purpose (6). To identify tenure preferences and to identify approximate preferred housing costs: (a) total cost of dwelling for owners and (b) monthly cost for renters.

Table XV reveals that the majority of respondents (79%) preferred to rent an apartment in the complex while the remaining respondents (21%) preferred to buy a unit in the complex.

TABLE XV
 TENURE PREFERENCES OF RESPONDENTS

Tenure	Number	Percent
Buy	38	20.88
Rent	144	79.12

Table XVI shows that among those respondents who preferred to buy their living unit, a larger proportion of persons (22%) preferred the total cost in the \$12,000 - \$13,999 range. A smaller proportion (10%) preferred a total cost of \$18,000 - \$20,000 and about one-third of the respondents felt they could not afford a unit unless it cost less than \$11,000.

TABLE XVI

APPROXIMATE PREFERRED HOUSING COSTS: TOTAL COST
OF DWELLING FOR RESPONDENTS DESIRING
TO OWN THEIR LIVING UNIT

Total Cost	Number	Percent
\$ 9,000-\$11,000	9	15.25
\$12,000-\$13,999	13	22.03
\$14,000-\$15,999	7	11.86
\$16,000-\$17,999	5	8.47
\$18,000-\$20,000	10	16.95
Over \$20,000	6	10.17
Cannot afford any of these	9	15.25

Table XVII illustrates that over 52 percent of the respondents desired apartments that could be rented for less than \$150 per month, including utilities.

TABLE XVII

APPROXIMATE PREFERRED HOUSING COSTS: TOTAL MONTHLY
COST (INCLUDING UTILITIES) OF DWELLING FOR
RESPONDENTS DESIRING TO RENT
THEIR LIVING UNIT

Total Monthly Cost	Number	Percent
\$100-\$124	37	23.12
\$125-\$149	37	23.12
\$150-\$174	31	19.37
\$175-\$200	30	18.75
Over \$200	15	9.38
Cannot afford any of these	10	6.25

Purpose (7). To determine if the interest (within each retirement status group) in living in such a retirement living complex varies according to occupational class: (a) salaried-academic, (b) salaried non-academic, and (c) wage non-academic.

Tables XVIII, XIX and XX show that there is no significant difference in the desire to live in a converted retirement complex in relation to occupational class. However, among the retired persons, a larger proportion of respondents in the salaried-academic occupational class indicated a desire to live in the complex than did those in the salaried and wage non-academic occupational class. Among those persons retiring within five years, a larger proportion of salaried-academic respondents indicated a desire to live in the complex than did respondents in any other occupational class. Of those persons retiring within ten years, a larger proportion of persons in the salaried and wage

non-academic occupational classes indicated a desire to live in the complex than did those of the salaried-academic group.

TABLE XVIII

DESIRE OF RETIRED PERSONS FOR LIVING IN A RETIREMENT
COMPLEX IN RELATION TO OCCUPATIONAL CLASS

Interest	<u>Salaried-Academic</u>		<u>Salaried and Wage Non-Academic</u>		χ^2	Level of Sig.
	No.	%	No.	%		
Yes	18	62	8	44	1.40	N.S.
No	11	38	10	56		

TABLE XIX

DESIRE OF PERSONS RETIRING WITHIN FIVE YEARS FOR
LIVING IN A RETIREMENT COMPLEX IN RELATION
TO OCCUPATIONAL CLASS

Interest	<u>Salaried-Academic</u>		<u>Salaried Non-Academic</u>		<u>Wage Non-Academic</u>		χ^2	Level of Sig.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Yes	20	56	13	54	6	46	0.35	N.S.
No	16	44	11	46	7	54		

TABLE XX

DESIRE OF PERSONS RETIRING WITHIN TEN YEARS FOR
LIVING IN A RETIREMENT COMPLEX IN RELATION
TO OCCUPATIONAL CLASS

Interest	<u>Salaried- Academic</u>		<u>Salaried and Wage Non-Academic</u>		χ^2	Level of Sig.
	No.	%	No.	%		
Yes	22	44	32	59	2.42	N.S.
No	28	56	22	41		

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The main purpose of this study was to examine the interest of Oklahoma State University retirees, present and future, in converting residence halls on the Oklahoma State University campus into retirement living complexes.

The sample consisted of 163 males and 70 females within the 50 to 74 year age range. The writer developed a questionnaire to obtain information necessary for this study. The questionnaire was pre-tested on a small group of persons over 50 years of age. Following this pre-test, minor alterations and additions were made. All respondents were either past employees of Oklahoma State University or were employed by the University at the time the study was conducted; they were either already retired or would retire within the next ten years.

Frequency and percentage distributions were used to examine some of the purposes. The results of this study were as follows:

1. More than half of the respondents expressed a desire to live in a residence hall which has been converted into a retirement living complex.
2. The most preferred services within or near the retirement complex were: (a) laundry facilities; (b) parking space for cars; (c) restaurant services; and (d) drug store services.

There was only a slight difference of preferences for services

according to sex of respondent. Parking space for cars was rated as first preference and laundry facilities as second preference among males. The reverse was reported among females.

3. Of the indoor facilities, those most preferred were: (a) reading rooms; (b) an arts and crafts area; and (c) a communal living room and lounge area. Preferences of indoor facilities differed according to sex of respondent. A greater proportion of the men preferred a men's exercise room, reading rooms and a communal living room and lounge area. Among the women, the arts and crafts area, spaces for adult education classes and reading rooms were the most preferred indoor facilities. Of the outdoor facilities, both sexes indicated a preference for good lighting at night, with other preferences as (a) benches; (b) covered walkways; and (c) a picnic area.
4. A larger proportion of respondents indicated a desire for a communal dining area in addition to kitchen-dining areas within each apartment. A large proportion of the respondents preferred a two bedroom apartment.
5. There were 48 respondents who indicated they would be interested in moving into the complex during the period 1975-1979; 49 respondents indicated a desire to live in the complex during the years 1980-1985.
6. The majority of respondents preferred to rent an apartment with the most preferred rental rate being under \$150 per month. Of those respondents who wished to buy their apartment

unit, the most preferred total cost of a unit was \$13,999 or under.

The chi-square test was used to examine two of the purposes. The results were as follows:

1. A greater proportion of both retirees and future retirees expressed positive interest in living in a residence hall which has been converted into a retirement complex. However, there was no significant difference between the two groups with regard to their desire to live in such a complex. A significant difference was found to exist between males and females concerning the desire to live in such a complex. The women in the study were more interested in living in the complex than were the men. A significant difference was also found concerning the respondents' present living status and the desire for living in a retirement complex. A greater proportion of persons living alone expressed a desire in living in the complex, while a smaller proportion of persons living with a spouse had no interest in living in the complex.
2. No significant difference was found concerning the desire to live in the complex in relationship to the three occupational classes considered: (a) salaried-academic; (b) salaried non-academic; and (c) wage non-academic.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The results of this study indicated a positive interest in the conversion of residence halls on campus into retirement living complexes. The findings suggested that it would be beneficial for

Oklahoma State University to explore the feasibility of renovating residence halls to serve as retirement complexes.

Because of the interest expressed by the respondents, it is suggested that work and plans begin immediately for the development of such a complex.

The findings indicated a preference for two-bedroom living units with only a limited number of one bedroom and living-bedroom efficiency units. A communal dining area would be highly desirable within the complex.

A variety of indoor and outdoor facilities should be incorporated into the complex. A communal living room and lounge area, reading rooms, arts and crafts areas, and space for adult education classes were frequently mentioned by respondents as desirable facilities. Of the outside areas, good lighting at night, benches, covered walkways and picnic areas were highly desired by the respondents.

Laundry facilities, parking for cars, restaurant and drug store services were indicated by respondents as being highly desirable within or near the retirement complex. These services should be given careful consideration in developing a residence hall which would best suit the needs of the potential residents.

It is recommended that further studies be undertaken to examine the architectural and economic feasibility of a retirement complex of this type. Should these studies be as supportive as this study has been concerning the conversion of residence halls into retirement living complexes, it is recommended that immediate action be taken in the direction of renovating residence halls into retirement living centers. A retirement living complex on the Oklahoma State University

campus would offer Stillwater residents a choice of where they may spend their retirement years. Close cooperation between university and city officials could result in a very socially, economically and aesthetically successful project for everyone involved.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atchley, Robert C.

- 1972 The Social Forces in Later Life. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Beckman, R. O.

- 1969 "Acceptance of Congregate Life in a Retirement Village." The Gerontologist, Vol. 9, No. 3, Part II (Autumn), pp. 281-85.

Beyer, Glenn H.

- 1961 Economic Aspects of Housing for the Aged. Cornell Research Program on Housing for the Aged, Report No. 4. Ithaca: Cornell University.

- 1965 Housing and Society. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Broom, Thad A.

- 1972 "A Proposal for Elderly Housing in Stillwater, Oklahoma" (Unpublished manuscript, Oklahoma State University).

Carp, Frances M.

- 1965 "Effects of Improved Housing on the Lives of Older People." Patterns of Living and Housing of Middle-Aged and Older People. Eds. Frances M. Carp and Wanda Burnett. Public Health Service Publication No. 1496. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, pp. 147-159.

- 1966 A Future for the Aged: Victoria Plaza and Its Residents. Austin: University of Texas Press.

City of Stillwater.

- 1973 Stillwater Population Characteristics. A Report Prepared by the City of Stillwater, Department of Community Development. Charles Harwood, Director, December.

Department of Health Studies, University of Oklahoma.

- 1971 The Older American in Oklahoma. A research study by the Department of Health Studies, University of Oklahoma, by contract with The Special Unit on Aging, State Department of Institutions, Social and Rehabilitative Services, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Eisdorfer, Carl.

- 1971 "Background and Theories of Aging." The Future of Aging and the Aged. Ed. George L. Maddox. Atlanta: Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation.

Grant, Donald P.

- 1970 "An Architect Discovers the Aged." The Gerontologist, Vol. 10, No. 4, Part I (Winter), pp. 275-281.

Hamovitch, Maurice B., and James Peterson.

- 1969 "Housing Needs and Satisfactions of the Elderly." The Gerontologist, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Spring), pp. 30-32.

Harvest Years.

- 1970 "Environment for Retirement." Harvest Years, Vol. 10, No. 3 (March), pp. 24-29.

Havighurst, Robert J.

- 1969 "Living Arrangements of Older People: Ecology." The Gerontologist, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Winter), pp. 37-54.

Heusinkveld, Helen.

- 1968 "Six New Pegs for Your Hat." Harvest Years, Vol. 8, No. 1 (January), pp. 7-14.

Hoppis, John.

- 1973 "The Older Oklahoman: Who is He, Where is He, and How is He Farring?" Understanding the Person. A report given to the Psycho-Social Aspects of Aging Workshop. Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, March 7, 8, 9.

Keeler, Lorene.

- 1973 "The Need for Independence: A Self-Sufficient Style of Living." Understanding the Person. A report given to the Psycho-Social Aspects of Aging Workshop. Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, March 7, 8, 9.

Kreps, Juanita M.

- 1971 "The Economics of Aging." The Future of Aging and the Aged. Ed. George L. Maddox. Atlanta: Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation.

Loether, Herman J.

- 1967 Problems of Aging. Belmont: Dickenson Publishing Company, Inc.

Loring, William C.

- 1961 "Design for a New Housing Concept: The Old." Architectural Forum, Vol. 114, No. 5, pp. 119-121, 176, 184.

Merkin, Leon.

- 1971 The Old Age Story. New York: Vantage Press.

Montgomery, James E.

- 1972 "The Housing Patterns of Older Families." The Family Coordinator, Vol. 21, No. 1 (January), pp. 37-46.

Mumford, Lewis.

- 1956 "For Older People -- Not Segregation but Integration." Architectural Record, Vol. 119, No. 5 (May), pp. 191-193.

National Council of the Aging, The.

- 1970 The Golden Years...A Tarnished Myth. New York: National Council on the Aging.

Oriol, William E.

- 1971 "Congress, Politics and the Elderly." The Future of Aging and the Aged. Ed. George L. Maddox. Atlanta: Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation.

Pryce, Cecelia.

- 1974 Personal interview about Stillwater Nursing Homes. Director of Nursing, Westhaven Nursing Home, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

Randall, Ollie A.

- 1956 "Changing Needs of Older People: Improved Homes for the Aged." Architectural Record, Vol. 119, No. 5 (May), pp. 208-212.

Sanderson, Carol A. Lowe.

- 1971 "The Week After Next." The Gerontologist, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Summer), pp. 3-58.

Schulz, James H.

- 1973 "The Economic Impact of an Aging Population." The Gerontologist, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Spring), pp. 111-118.

Shanas, Ethel.

- 1969 "Living Arrangements and Housing of Old People." Behavior and Adaption in Later Life. Eds. Ewald Busse and Eric Pfeiffer. Boston: Little Brown and Company.

Spector, Sidney.

- 1964 "The Need for Housing Specially Designed for Senior Citizens." Social Change and Aging in the Twentieth Century. University of Florida Institute of Gerontology, Vol. 13. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.

Tucson Community Council Committee on the Aged.

- 1960 Older Citizens in Our Town. Tucson: Tucson Community Council.

United States Bureau of the Census.

- 1973 1970 Census of Population: Characteristics of the Population: Oklahoma. Vol. 1, Part 38 (February), Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

- 1973 "New Facts About Older Americans." Office of Human Development Administration on Aging. DHEW Publication No. (SRS) 73-20006 (June). Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Walkley, Rosabelle P., Wiley P. Mangum, Jr., Susan R. Sherman, Suzanne Dodds, and Daniel M. Wilner.

- 1966 Retirement Housing in California. Los Angeles: Diablo Press.

Wilner, Daniel M., and Rosabelle P. Walkley.

- 1966 "Some Special Problems and Alternatives in Housing for Older Persons." Aging and Social Policy. Eds. John C. McKinney and Frank T. deVyver. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

12. If you are gainfully employed at present (either full- or part-time) please state your occupation. Be specific.

13. If you are now retired, what was your occupation for the major part of your life? Be specific.

14. At present do you:
- 1. Live alone
 - 2. Live with your spouse
 - 3. Live in the home of children, other relatives, or friends
 - 4. Live in a retirement community
 - 5. Live in a nursing home
15. Are you presently living in:
- 1. Single family dwelling
 - 2. Duplex
 - 3. Apartment
 - 4. Mobile home
 - 5. Other (specify): _____
16. At present do you:
- 1. Rent your dwelling
 - 2. Own your dwelling
 - 3. Pay no rent or rent free
 - 4. Other (specify): _____
17. At present do you have to take care of maintenance and repairs to your dwelling?
- 1. Yes
 - 2. No
18. IF YES, would you like to live where you do not have to take care of maintenance and repairs?
- 1. Yes
 - 2. No
19. If you have not yet retired, do you plan to retire in Stillwater?
- 1. Yes
 - 2. No
20. IF NO, would you be more likely to retire in Stillwater if some retirement housing was available?
- 1. Yes
 - 2. No
21. If an older dormitory at OSU were converted into a retirement housing complex, would you consider living in the complex?
- 1. Yes
 - 2. No

- ___ 29. What features would you want in an outdoor recreational area near the housing complex?
 (Check as many as you please.)
- ___ 1. Your own garden area
 - ___ 2. Covered walkways
 - ___ 3. Benches
 - ___ 4. Good lighting at night
 - ___ 5. Horseshoe, shuffleboard, or croquet
 - ___ 6. Picnic area
 - ___ 7. Others: _____
- ___ 30. What features would you want in an indoor recreational area within the complex?
 (Check as many as you please.)
- ___ 1. Dominoes/card games
 - ___ 2. Reading rooms
 - ___ 3. Meeting rooms
 - ___ 4. Communal living room and lounge area
 - ___ 5. Men's exercise room
 - ___ 6. Women's exercise room
 - ___ 7. Arts and crafts area
 - ___ 8. Adult education classes
 - ___ 9. Others: _____
- ___ 31. Which of the following do you value the most in a retirement housing complex?
 (Please number according to your order of preferences; 1 is first preference.)
- ___ 1. Economy
 - ___ 2. Comfort
 - ___ 3. Safety
 - ___ 4. Privacy
 - ___ 5. Beauty
 - ___ 6. Convenient to services (telephone, mail services, transportation services, etc.)
 - ___ 7. Space for overnight visitors
 - ___ 8. Companionship-association with people other than your family
- ___ 32. How many bedrooms would you like?
- ___ 1. Living room-bedroom combination
 - ___ 2. One
 - ___ 3. Two
- ___ 33. In addition to your own kitchen-dining area, would you want a communal dining area or cafeteria within the housing complex?
- ___ 1. Yes
 - ___ 2. No
- ___ 34. Would you need transportation arrangements to and from activities and services outside the immediate campus area?
- ___ 1. Yes
 - ___ 2. No

- ___ 35. Which of the following campus activities would you be likely to attend:
- | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-----|---------------------|
| ___ | 1. Educational classes | ___ | 5. Athletic events |
| ___ | 2. Guest speakers | ___ | 6. Theater/musicals |
| ___ | 3. Guest entertainers | ___ | 7. Art exhibits |
| ___ | 4. Seminars/workshops/
conferences | ___ | 8. Field trips |
| ___ | | ___ | 9. Others: _____ |
- ___ 36. Approximately what is your average monthly income (after taxes)?
- | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|-----|------------------|
| ___ | 1. Less than \$350 | ___ | 5. \$750-\$999 |
| ___ | 2. \$350-\$449 | ___ | 6. \$1000-\$1249 |
| ___ | 3. \$450-\$549 | ___ | 7. \$1250-\$1500 |
| ___ | 4. \$550-\$749 | ___ | 8. Over \$1500 |
- ___ 37. Where does your money come from?
(Check more than one, if applicable.)
- | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|-----|--|
| ___ | 1. Earnings | ___ | 6. Savings and investments |
| ___ | 2. Social Security | ___ | 7. Annuity (a fixed income
paid at intervals for a
period of time) |
| ___ | 3. Employee pension | ___ | 8. Other |
| ___ | 4. Relatives | | |
| ___ | 5. Old Age Assistance | | |
- ___ 38. Is your monthly income sufficient to meet your monthly expenditures?
- | | |
|-----|--------|
| ___ | 1. Yes |
| ___ | 2. No |
- ___ 39. If you are not retired now, do you expect your monthly spending to decrease upon retirement?
- | | |
|-----|--------|
| ___ | 1. Yes |
| ___ | 2. No |
- ___ 40. Within a retirement living complex, would you prefer to:
- | | |
|-----|---------|
| ___ | 1. Buy |
| ___ | 2. Rent |
- ___ 41. If you prefer to buy, what would be the maximum amount you would pay for an apartment to fit your needs?
- | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----|----------------------------------|
| ___ | 1. \$9,000-\$11,000 | ___ | 5. \$18,000-\$20,000 |
| ___ | 2. \$12,000-\$13,999 | ___ | 6. Over \$20,000 |
| ___ | 3. \$14,000-\$15,999 | ___ | 7. Cannot afford any of
these |
| ___ | 4. \$16,000-\$17,999 | | |
- ___ 42. If you prefer to rent, what is the maximum payment you would pay per month, including utilities?
- | | | | |
|-----|----------------|-----|----------------------------------|
| ___ | 1. \$100-\$124 | ___ | 4. \$175-\$200 |
| ___ | 2. \$125-\$149 | ___ | 5. Over \$200 |
| ___ | 3. \$150-\$174 | ___ | 6. Cannot afford any of
these |

Thank you for your cooperation. This information will be treated confidentially but will assist me in my thesis and OSU in future planning.

VITA ²

Kathryn Kinstle Joos

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: CONVERSION OF OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY RESIDENCE HALLS FOR
RETIRED PERSONNEL HOUSING

Major Field: Housing and Interior Design

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Corpus Christi, Texas, February 27, 1948,
the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Arlo R. Kinstle. Married Paul
H. Joos, December 29, 1973, in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Education: Graduated from Putnam City High School, Oklahoma City,
Oklahoma, in May, 1966; graduated from Oklahoma State Univer-
sity, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in January, 1971, with a Bachelor
of Science degree in Housing and Interior Design; completed
requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma
State University in May, 1975.

Professional Experience: Design Consultant, Sears, Roebuck, and
Company, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1971; graduate teaching
assistant, School of Home Economics, Oklahoma State Univer-
sity, 1972-74.

Professional Organizations: Omicron Nu; Phi Kappa Phi.