



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 9
Issue 2 June

Article 14

June 1982

Special Problems Faced by the Elderly Victims of Crime

J. David Hirschel

University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Karen B. Rubin

Gastonia Psychiatric Group

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>



Part of the Gerontology Commons, Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance Commons, and the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Hirschel, J. David and Rubin, Karen B. (1982) "Special Problems Faced by the Elderly Victims of Crime," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 9: Iss. 2, Article 14.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.1533>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol9/iss2/14>

This Article is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

SPECIAL PROBLEMS FACED BY THE ELDERLY VICTIMS OF CRIME

J. David Hirschel, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Karen B. Rubin, Ph.D.
Gastonia Psychiatric Group

ABSTRACT

Recently, increased attention has been paid to the problems faced by the elderly within our society. One of the most pressing problems is the threat of crime. This article examines the actual risk of criminal victimization among the elderly, the physical, financial, and psychological consequences of victimization, and the special problems faced by the elderly as they attempt to deal with the criminal justice system. Finally, their fear of crime, which in itself constitutes a very real form of victimization, is explored.

Introduction

Recently our society has begun to show an increasing awareness of, and concern for, the issue of aging and the problems of growing old in the twentieth century United States. In an advanced industrial nation which is beset by high and ever increasing crime rates, the elderly, along with the very young, seem particularly ill-equipped to cope with the threat of crime. While the very young have long been given added protection by the law, the elderly have not traditionally enjoyed a privileged status. Yet arguably those who have already contributed a vast number of working years to society should be given some added attention and protection so that they can live out the last stages of their lives with some sense of serenity. Three major issues present themselves for examination. First, how may the elderly guard against criminal victimization? Second, when safeguards have failed, how may the problems of elderly crime victims be alleviated? And third, how can the overwhelming fear of crime and its devastating consequences among the elderly population be diminished?

It is to the second and third issues that this article will be addressed. In particular, we will be concerned with the physical, economic and psychological consequences of criminal victimization; the special problems the elderly victim of crime has to face as he or she attempts to deal with the criminal justice system; and the effect that fear of crime has on the elderly.

Defining the Elderly as a Group

Before we can embark upon an examination of the special problems that criminal victimization poses for the elderly, we must develop an understanding of

the nature of this group. In addition, it is important for us to differentiate between those factors which constitute real limitations for the elderly, and those which represent stereotypes or "mythical" limitations, so that we can develop realistic coping and/or prospective strategies for the elderly.

The elderly as a group are highly heterogeneous, more so than any other age group. Thus any generalization derived from research is less likely to be true for a given elderly individual than for a younger person. This results in significant limitations on group planning. Pragmatically, this fact has been seen in at least one victim survey that attempted to put together a composite profile of the aged and was unable to do so, due to the overriding individual differences (Burkhardt and Norton, 1977). A second provision that limits the conclusions of this or any other paper that discusses the elderly as a group is the difficulty in differentiating cohort effects from the developmental effects of aging *per se*. The socio-cultural conditions of today differ dramatically and in many different ways from the conditions in which today's elderly "grew up" or, perhaps more significantly, from the social culture in which these individuals spent their prime learning and working years. Being young in 1950 was very different - in cultural expectations, in technological and scientific knowledge - than being young or even middle-aged in 1981.

With the above caveats in mind, a number of physical, intellectual and psychological changes have been identified as characteristic of the elderly as a group. Among the most obvious and commonly noted physical changes are deterioration in organ function (such as eyesight and hearing acuity) and increased rates of chronic disease (such as arthritis, diabetes, coronary heart disease). Sensory thresholds tend to become lowered so that it takes sharper differentiations for stimuli to be registered. Finally, there is an overall slowing, in perception, memory functions, learning new skills, performance of motor tasks, and central nervous system processing in general. It has also been noted that physical functioning requires increased attention with increased age (after 50), largely due to the slowed neural processing. Cognitive changes that are age-related include an increase in distractability with a concomitant decreased capacity to ignore irrelevant information. Acquisition of new skills becomes more difficult, and increased mental inflexibility tends to interfere with the ability to solve novel problems, to change mental set, and generally to adapt to new interactions. Finally, there is evidence of increased memory deficits, particularly in immediate short term memory and organization of time and space (Lezak, 1976). Among the emotional changes that typically accompany aging are increased cautiousness (and decreased willingness to take risks) and changes in motivation. Individual motivation to engage in certain tasks of daily living, to use memory to aid thinking, and to take the tests used in research studies all become more variable and less reliable among aging cohorts.

Although the above changes and limitations are reasonably well documented (Schonfield, 1974; Schaie, 1974; Birren, 1974), there are several stereotypes and myths of limitations that need to be exorcised before we proceed. Briefly, these include the myth of an inevitable and global intellectual decline, and the

overused designation of senility. Although there are certainly individuals who show steady and global decreases in intellectual skills, it is much more common for specific declines to take place, with well-established skills showing only minor deficits. This myth is, unfortunately, intertwined with the result of cohort effects: the areas and kinds of learning required when an individual is in school or apprenticing a job may, through expanded technology, become grossly deficient as the individual ages.

The second major stereotype, that of senility, fortunately applies to only a small minority of the aged. This convenient catch-all more frequently draws attention away from other processes. These include brain damage, depression, and a host of normal psychological processes, such as concentration difficulties, pre-occupation and responses to emotional stress (Butler, 1976).

These images of the elderly as senile and incompetent are, then, inaccurate. They do, however, represent prevalent stereotypes of the elderly which characterize them as vulnerable, and thus make them attractive targets for muggers, con men, and the like.

Risks of Criminal Victimization Among the Elderly

A statement that is frequently made about the elderly is that they are under-represented among the victims of crime in general. The most comprehensive data available on this issue is that collected by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in its annual national crime survey reports. These reports cover both crimes against the person and crimes against households. An examination of the data for the years 1973 to 1979 reveals that the elderly (those 65 and over) have noticeably lower victimization rates for all of the crimes of violence covered in the survey (rape, robbery and assault), and for crimes of personal larceny without contact (see Appendix A). With regard to crimes of personal larceny with contact, however, the elderly frequently have higher victimization rates than the other age groups. This is due to their overrepresentation among the victims of purse-snatching.

An examination of the findings of the national crime survey reports for household crimes by type of crime and age of the head of the household shows that it is consistently the household with the oldest heads of household that have the lowest victimization rates. This is so whether we are considering the crime of burglary, household larceny, or motor vehicle theft (see Appendix B).

This research does suggest that criminal victimization may occur less frequently among the elderly than among other age groups. It should be noted, however, that these surveys do not cover crimes to which the elderly may be particularly susceptible, such as various crimes of fraud, confidence games and medical quackery. Thus, for example, in a nationwide survey of police departments, confidence games and deceptive practices were the criminal activities most commonly cited by the responding agencies as being one of the five crimes to which the elderly most frequently fall victims (Gross, 1976:26). In addition, the elderly,

as stated above, constitute a rather heterogeneous group, including individuals who may never venture from their homes and thus do not run the risk of becoming the victims of various types of crimes. Thus it has been argued that victimization rates should be adjusted in the light of the extent to which individuals are at risk (Select Committee on Aging, 1977:19). Research has, in fact, indicated that the elderly are more likely than other age groups both to be the victims of violent crimes in or near their homes (Antunes et al, 1977:323) and to limit or change their activities because of fear of crime (Parisi et al, 1978:293).

Finally, it should be noted that fear may lead the elderly, more than other age groups, not to report their victimizations, even to the interviewers who conduct the victimization surveys.

Aftermath and Effects of Criminal Victimization

With certain caveats, we have established that the actual risk of criminal victimization that the elderly face may be less than that of other age groups. What, however, of the consequences of criminal victimization?

Physical, Financial and Psychological Consequences

It has been suggested that the consequences of criminal victimization are harsher for the elderly than for any other age group. Because so many of them are frailer, they are more likely to be physically hurt. Because so many are living on fixed incomes, they are less able to absorb financial losses. Because so many of them are more fearful and isolated from others, the psychological consequences may be more severe. As a former Director of the F.B.I. has stated:

Typically of course older persons are among those least able to afford the depredations of crime. Limited financial resources, fixed incomes, and reduced employment opportunities make even a slight monetary loss a catastrophe. Also, physiological and psychological factors, attendant to aging, make the elderly more vulnerable and less resilient to the trauma and personal injury of criminal attack. Accordingly, crime leaves a deeper, more lasting mark, and injuries incurred may be more disabling and require a longer recovery period (Kelly, 1976:1)

Such sentiments have been echoed both by researchers (Friedman, 1976:112; Goldsmith and Goldsmith, 1976:2; Hahn, 1976:121-133) and by legislative bodies (Select Committee on Aging, 1977:26-28) that have investigated the plight of the elderly victim of crime.

There is, however, by no means total agreement on this issue. As a result of their analysis of the 1973 and 1974 L.E.A.A. National Crime Surveys, Cook, Skogan, Cook and Antunes concluded that the data they examined offered "scant

systematic support to persons who believe that when elderly Americans are victimized by criminals, they suffer more severe financial or physical hardship than younger persons (1978:346)." They did note, however, that "when dollar loss from crimes are adjusted for differences in monthly income," "the elderly lose less than young people, but the same or more than other adults (343)," and that, although the elderly "are attacked less often than others," they "are among the more likely to be injured when attacked (345)." Finally, though they are no more likely than others to require medical care, "the costs of the care constitute a considerably larger portion of their income than is the case for other groups (346)."

An examination of the L.E.A.A. National Crime Survey reports for the years 1973 to 1979 reveals that the elderly (those 65 and over) were less likely than other age groups to sustain physical injury as a result of an assault, but more likely than other age groups to be injured as a result of a robbery. As can be seen from Table I, over the seven year period a mean of 28.5% of assault victims, and 33.2% of robbery victims of all ages were injured as a result of their criminal victimization. For elderly victims these percentages were 22.9 and 41.1 respectively. When an examination was undertaken of the percentage of victimizations in which victims received hospital care, it was observed that the elderly were generally overrepresented among the robbery victims who required such care, but underrepresented among the assault victims. Some of that data is, however, acknowledged to be statistically unreliable (U.S. Department of Justice, 1976, 1977a, 1977b, 1978, 1979, 1980a, 1981).

The concern here is whether the consequences of criminal victimization may be more severe for the elderly than for other age groups. The elderly are underrepresented among the victims of violent crimes such as robbery, assault and homicide. Because of their frailer physical condition, a physical attack may, however, have more severe consequences for an elderly person than for a younger person. Possibly, the same physical attack that would result in a young person being hospitalized for physical injuries would result in an elderly person dying. Thus instead of being recorded as an assault, the incident would be classified as a homicide.

Here the data collected by the F.B.I. on homicide is of interest. While nearly two-thirds of all homicide victims are killed by firearms, the percentage of the elderly (and of the young) who die in this fashion is less than one-third. As can be seen from Table II, in 1979 63.3% of all homicide victims died as a result of injuries inflicted by firearms. For those aged 60 to 74, however, this percentage was 50.6, and for those aged 75 and over, 30.3. While the elderly were underrepresented among the victims of homicide who died from firearms, they were overrepresented among the victims who died from blows with blunt objects such as clubs or hammers, or from "personal weapons" (hands, fists, feet, etc.) or who were strangled or asphyxiated. Thus, while only 4.9% of all homicide victims died from blows from blunt objects, 5.6% from the use of personal weapons, and 2.4% from strangulation or asphyxiation, the percentages of those aged 60 to 74 who died by these means were 11.2, 8.6 and 4.5, and for those aged 75 and over, 14.4, 19.4 and 9.7 respectively. This provides some evidence that the same act may have more severe consequences for the elderly than for many of the younger age groups.

Table I

Personal Robbery and Assault. Percentage of victimizations in which victims sustained physical injury by age, 1973-1979.

<u>Robbery</u>								
	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1973</u>
All Ages	33.2	34.1	31.8	35.6	32.5	31.5	32.6	34.0
65 & over	41.1	41.7	40.0	57.5	37.9	27.8	49.1	34.0
50 - 64	38.2	38.1	37.7	31.3	42.1	39.4	35.9	43.0
35 - 49	34.9	28.9	39.1	31.3	35.2	33.3	37.8	39.0
25 - 34	34.5	36.0	33.0	41.3	34.2	35.5	29.5	32.0
20 - 24	33.7	36.1	36.5	40.6	27.4	29.7	30.9	35.0
16 - 19	32.7	37.0	24.8	33.0	34.4	32.6	30.8	36.0
12 - 15	23.3	25.3	18.3	24.4	20.8	23.0	26.1	25.0

<u>Assault</u>								
	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1973</u>
All Ages	28.5	28.7	28.2	27.8	29.5	29.5	27.8	28.0
65 & over	22.9	20.0	20.6	16.6	22.4	33.4	18.3	29.0
50 - 64	21.4	19.7	18.8	22.5	19.5	22.7	23.4	23.0
35 - 49	25.8	27.0	25.8	28.3	23.2	27.0	25.1	24.0
25 - 34	26.1	28.1	27.3	24.3	25.4	26.0	24.5	27.0
20 - 24	28.3	29.8	25.2	27.1	33.8	27.6	27.7	27.0
16 - 19	30.8	29.2	30.3	31.4	35.2	30.9	29.5	29.0
12 - 15	34.4	33.1	37.9	32.9	31.8	38.9	35.3	31.0

Source: U.S. Department of Justice (1976, 1977a, 1977b, 1978, 1979, 1980a, 1981).

Table II

Murder victims by age and type of weapon used, 1979.

Age	Firearm	Cutting or stabbing instrument	Blunt object (club, hammer etc.)	Personal Weapons (hands, fists, feet, etc.)	Strangulation		Total
					Asphyxiation	Other or Unknown	
75 & over	134 (30.3%)	72 (16.3%)	64 (14.4%)	86 (19.4%)	43 (9.7%)	44 (9.9%)	443
60 - 74	703 (50.6%)	265 (19.0%)	155 (11.2%)	120 (8.6%)	62 (4.5%)	84 (6.1%)	1,389
45 - 59	1,969 (63.9%)	531 (17.2%)	181 (5.9%)	197 (6.4%)	63 (2.1%)	140 (4.5%)	3,081
30 - 44	4,001 (69.5%)	1,096 (19.1%)	235 (4.1%)	204 (3.5%)	73 (1.3%)	144 (2.5%)	5,753
15 - 29	5,812 (67.1%)	1,826 (21.1%)	286 (3.3%)	272 (3.1%)	193 (2.2%)	279 (3.2%)	8,668
Under 15	211 (24.0%)	91 (10.3%)	51 (5.8%)	268 (30.5%)	58 (6.6%)	201 (22.8%)	880
Unknown	210 (55.7%)	73 (19.4%)	25 (6.6%)	8 (2.1%)	10 (2.7%)	51 (13.5%)	377
Total	13,040 (63.3%)	3,954 (19.2%)	997 (4.9%)	1,155 (5.6%)	502 (2.4%)	943 (4.6%)	20,591

Source: U.S. Department of Justice (1980b:11)

The Elderly Victim and the Criminal Justice System

In addition to the physical and economic consequences of criminal victimization, interaction with the criminal justice system poses special problems for the elderly. It is recognized that victims of all ages may for a wide variety of reasons be hesitant to report their criminal victimization to the police. Although the National Crime Survey reports show that the elderly do not tend to report crime less frequently than other age groups (U.S. Department of Justice, 1976, 1977a, 1977b, 1978, 1979, 1980b, 1981), it is possible that fear of reprisal by the offender and fear of dealing with officials lead them not to report their criminal victimizations either to the police or to the interviewers who conduct the victimization surveys. In addition, it is also possible that the fear of looking foolish may prompt many of them not to report any confidence game that may have been played on them.

Lack of knowledge of the criminal justice process is fairly widespread. Many people do not know what to expect of the police, the prosecutor or the court system. In addition, the various officials in the criminal justice system have not been markedly adept at providing the victims of crime with information either about what is expected of them, or what is happening to their case. These general concerns experienced by crime victims of all ages may be compounded for the elderly because of a generally heightened sense of anxiety and their greater difficulties in changing mental set and dealing with novel situations.

For most persons, regardless of age, courtroom procedures elicit diffuse states of anxiety because of lack of familiarity with the proceedings and fear of making a mistake or looking foolish. In addition to these general anxieties, there are a number of particular rigors and concerns in the courtroom for the elderly. Their credibility as eyewitnesses is automatically tested because of stereotypic perceptions of their weakening eyesight, hearing, etc. Unfortunately, the difficulty in making positive identification of the aggressor is often real (due to failing senses), but the elderly eyewitness tends to be even less sure of himself and thus less credible to the court regardless of actual perceptual abilities. In a similar vein, the speed and stress of questioning frequently results in disorientation and mental confusion, which can be easily used by aggressive lawyers to further discredit testimony given. It should be noted that we are not referring here to confused or senile individuals but to those whose mental functions are intact, yet who make poor mental connections when pressed for speedy answers on the witness stand.

The intimidation that is experienced by the elderly in the courtroom is also likely to be present in their dealings with other officials and the public: greater numbers of the elderly live alone and they are frequently home to receive threatening visits or phone calls from aggressors. Revictimization is also a problem (Goldsmith, 1976), and research has indicated that the elderly may be particularly susceptible to revictimization by the same offender(s) (Select Committee on Aging, 1977:27). This obviously compounds all the previously cited effects and consequences.

A final difficulty that faces the elderly population is that of receiving compensation for loss or damage to property that may be of low monetary value while representing great personal value. By the same token, minor injuries sustained in an incident of criminal contact may not impress the court or compensation board; the interaction of new, "minor" injuries, however, with chronic physical conditions may interfere greatly with physical mobility. Indeed, the requirement of many state crime compensation boards that the victim have suffered a certain minimum dollar loss in order to obtain compensation may disproportionately affect the elderly.

Fear as a Consequence of Criminal Victimization

It is well documented that the elderly have a great fear of crime. In a Louis Harris poll conducted in 1974, elderly respondents were asked to state the most serious problems they faced. Fear of crime was the most commonly cited problem, ahead of health, money and loneliness. The percentage of respondents mentioning each of the above was 23, 21, 15, and 12 respectively (National Council on the Aging, 1975). In an examination of the research conducted by the National Opinion Research Center in 1965, 1967, 1968, 1973 and 1974, Cook and Cook noted that in each of these years it was the oldest age cohort that exhibited the greatest amount of fear (1976:641). In a 1975 survey of thirteen cities, 19% of the elderly reported that they felt unsafe being out alone in their neighborhoods during the day and 64% stated that they felt unsafe being out alone at night. This compared with mean percentages of 11 and 46 for all age groups on these two questions (Parisi et al, 1978:290). Generally, it has been observed that among the elderly, fear of crime is greater for women than for men, for blacks than for whites, for the poor, and for those living in larger communities (Select Committee on Aging, 1977:41-42).

The thesis of this paper is not only that the physical and financial consequences of criminal victimization may be more severe for the elderly than for other age groups. There is the added concern that the well documented fear of criminal victimization among the aged too often leads to social, physical and psychological consequences so severe that fear thus represents a form of victimization that is global and general in nature, regardless of actual occurrence of criminal contact. A number of sources have referred to the psychological consequences of fear as a debilitating factor in the lives of many elderly persons (Harel and Broderick, 1980; Burkhardt and Norton, 1977; Select Committee on Aging, 1977).

The practical consequences of living in fear have been described in graphic terms, with the fear of going out of their homes referred to as a state of self-imposed "house arrest" (Goldsmith, 1976). Unfortunately, this behavior pattern alone - that of rarely venturing out of the house - has extensive and devastating results for the individual, setting further limits on mobility, capacity and opportunities for life satisfaction in later years. The lack of physical mobility decreases the number and frequency of social contacts open to the person; it circumscribes arenas of cultural and environmental stimulation as well. Decreased exercise of cognitive and physical functions resulting from the understimulation noted above is associated with gradual deterioration of the functions. As the

disuse continues, the individual's cognitive and bodily organ systems tend to show greater and greater losses. Equally serious is the state of psychological immobility that typically accompanies fear and which consists of a feeling state of helplessness, powerlessness and vulnerability. Psychological immobility has its own set of behavioral consequences whereby the immobilized individual shows the dependency and incapacity of an invalid, and typically develops increasingly pervasive and complex rationales for not going out and not participating in activities. The analogy to imprisonment is also relevant in light of the acute and chronic anxiety that frequently characterizes the individual's thought content. This is a recurrent theme in clinical and social casework descriptions of those who work with the elderly living in fear.

Conclusion

Thus, in spite of a number of surveys which indicate that the elderly have lower risks of victimization than other segments of the population, the consequences of that victimization are frequently more harmful for the aged. Research suggests that the physical, economic and psychological consequences of criminal victimization may be disproportionately severe for the elderly. Foremost among these effects is the fear of victimization, which has been repeatedly documented as high among elderly samples and which is frequently associated with immobility and decreased levels of functioning.

Any strategies that aim at alleviating the special problems faced by the elderly as potential or actual victims of crime must also deal with the fear of crime. One fruitful avenue of approach may be to explore on an individual basis the exact nature of this global fear. We cannot, for example, state categorically that installing locks and other protective devices in an elderly person's home will increase his feeling of security; it may merely heighten his fear level. The approaches to dealing with fear thus seem to lie in the realm of traditional "social casework" and the expansion of our current expectations of what police work and criminal justice services encompass to take individual fears into greater account.

In addition to the devastating effects of fear, it is evident that the elderly face special problems in the aftermath of criminal victimization. Other researchers have concluded that

service and assistance programs for victims and witnesses should not be so narrow in scope that they are primarily oriented to specific target groups such as blacks, women or the elderly (Knudten et al, 1976:143).

We are in agreement with this conclusion. It is important that all crime victims receive the assistance they need and that they are dealt with in an empathetic and courteous manner by criminal justice officials. However, when dealing with an elderly victim, it is important that these officials take into account the real limitations that the process of aging may place on that individual. Thus, for

example, when questioning an elderly victim, the police officer and prosecuting attorney should bear in mind that an elderly person may need more time to gather his or her thoughts to respond effectively to a question, and thus should be allowed more time to formulate a response. In addition, it may be advisable to cut down on the outside distractions to which the elderly are particularly susceptible so that the efficiency of their mental processing may be enhanced.

In conclusion, it may be seen from our exploration of the special problems faced by the elderly victims of crime that solutions must be developed within the context of the many individual differences and needs that exist among the elderly. Such solutions will be complex and multi-dimensional, and will require research and creative efforts on the part of clinicians and public officials as well as academicians and researchers.

REFERENCES

- Antunes, George E., Fay L. Cook, Thomas D. Cook and Wesley G. Skogan
1977 "Patterns of personal crime against the elderly: Findings from a national survey." *The Gerontologist* 17:321-327.
- Birren, James E.
1974 "From lab to life: Psychophysiology and speed of response." *American Psychologist* 29:808-815.
- Burkhardt, John E. and Lee Norton
1977 *Crime and the Elderly: Their Perceptions and Reactions*. Prepared for the Department of Police, Montgomery County, Maryland.
- Butler, Robert
1976 "Aging's best advocate . . . an interview with Robert Butler." *APA Monitor* March:14-15.
- Cook, Fay L. and Thomas D. Cook.
1976 "Evaluating the rhetoric of crisis: A case study of criminal victimization of the elderly." *Social Service Review* 50:632-645.
- Cook, Fay L., Wesley G. Skogan, Thomas D. Cook and George E. Antunes
1978 "Criminal victimization of the elderly: The physical and economic consequences." *The Gerontologist* 18:338-349.
- Friedman, David M.
1976 "A service model for elderly crime victims." Pp. 111-118 in J. Goldsmith and S.S. Goldsmith (eds.), *Crime and the Elderly*. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath.
- Goldsmith, Jack
1976 "Police and the older victim: Keys to a changing perspective." *The Police Chief* 43(2): 19-23.

- Goldsmith, Jack and Sharon S. Goldsmith
1976 Crime and the Elderly. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath.
- Gross, Philip J.
1976 "Law enforcement and the senior citizen." The Police Chief 43(2):24-27.
- Hahn, Paul H.
1976 Crimes Against the Elderly. Santa Cruz, Calif.: Davis.
- Harel, Zev and Kathleen Broderick
1980 "Victimization and fear of crime among the urban aged." The Police Chief 47(3):34-36, 65.
- Kelley, Clarence M.
1976 "Message from the director." FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin 45:1-2.
- Knudten, Richard D., Anthony Meade, Mary Knudten and William Doerner
1976 "The victim in the administration of criminal justice: Problems and perceptions." Pp. 115-146 in W.F. McDonald (ed.), Criminal Justice and the Victim. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Lezak, Muriel D.
1976 Neuropsychological Assessment. New York: Oxford University Press.
- National Council on the Aging
1975 The Myth and Reality of Aging in America. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Parisi, Nicolette, Michael R. Gottfredson, Michael J. Hindelang and Timothy J. Flanagan (eds.)
1979 Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics - 1978. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Schaie, K. Warner
1974 "Lab to life: Intellectual functioning." American Psychologist 29:802-807.
- Schonfield, David
1974 "Translations in gerontology - from lab to life: Utilizing information." American Psychologist 29:796-801.
- Select Committee on Aging, Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests
1977 In Search of Security: A National Perspective on Elderly Crime Victimization. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Justice
1976 Criminal Victimization in the United States 1973. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- U.S. Department of Justice
1977a Criminal Victimization in the United States 1974. Washington, D.C.:
U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Justice
1977b Criminal Victimization in the United States 1975. Washington, D.C.:
U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Justice
1978 Criminal Victimization in the United States 1976. Washington, D.C.:
U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Justice
1979 Criminal Victimization in the United States 1977. Washington, D.C.:
U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Justice
1980a Criminal Victimization in the United States 1978. Washington, D.C.:
U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Justice
1980b FBI Uniform Crime Reports: Crime in the United States 1979.
Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Justice
1981 Criminal Victimization in the United States 1979. Washington, D.C.:
U.S. Government Printing Office.

Appendix A

Personal Crimes: Victimization Rates for Persons Age Twelve and Over
By Type of Crime and Age of Victims, 1973 - 1979
(Rate per 1,000 population in each age group)

<u>All Ages</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1973</u>
<u>Crimes of Violence</u>	34.5	33.7	33.9	32.6	32.7	32.8	34.0
Rape	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.0
Robbery	6.3	5.9	6.2	6.5	6.7	7.1	7.0
Assault	27.2	26.9	26.8	25.3	25.1	24.7	26.0
<u>Crimes of Theft</u>	91.9	96.8	97.3	96.1	95.8	94.9	93.0
Personal larceny with contact	2.9	3.1	2.7	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.0
purse snatching	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.9	1.1	0.9	1.0
pocket picking	1.9	2.1	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.0
Personal larceny without contact	89.0	93.6	94.6	93.2	92.7	91.8	90.0
<u>65 & Over</u>							
<u>Crimes of Violence</u>	5.9	7.9	7.5	7.6	7.8	9.0	9.0
Rape	Z	0.1*	0.1*	0.1*	0.1*	0.2*	Z
Robbery	2.5	3.0	3.4	3.4	4.3	3.9	5.0
Assault	3.4	4.7	4.0	4.1	3.4	4.9	4.0
<u>Crimes of Theft</u>	21.6	23.0	23.6	26.0	24.5	21.9	23.0
Personal larceny with contact	3.5	2.9	2.4	3.3	3.3	3.4	4.0
purse snatching	1.6	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.8	1.4	2.0
pocket picking	1.9	1.6	1.4	2.1	1.5	2.0	2.0
Personal larceny without contact	18.1	20.1	21.2	22.9	21.2	18.5	19.0
<u>50-64</u>							
<u>Crimes of Violence</u>	11.4	10.3	12.8	12.2	13.5	11.8	13.0
Rape	0.3*	0.1*	0.1*	0.1*	0.2*	0.3	Z
Robbery	3.3	3.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.0
Assault	7.8	6.7	8.4	7.6	8.9	7.3	8.0

<u>50-64</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1973</u>
<u>Crimes of Theft</u>	55.7	52.9	57.4	59.0	51.3	49.4	48.0
Personal larceny with contact	4.0	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.7	3.5	3.0
purse snatching	1.7	1.2	0.9	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.0
pocket picking	2.3	1.4	1.6	1.8	1.4	1.9	2.0
Personal larceny without contact	51.8	50.4	54.9	55.8	48.6	45.9	44.0
<u>35-49</u>							
<u>Crimes of Violence</u>	21.3	19.9	19.9	20.0	20.5	20.8	22.0
Rape	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.3*	0.2*	2
Robbery	5.1	4.6	4.5	5.1	4.6	5.5	5.0
Assault	15.6	15.0	15.1	14.8	15.6	15.2	16.0
<u>Crimes of Theft</u>	80.8	84.4	87.0	82.6	80.2	79.2	74.0
Personal larceny with contact	2.1	2.4	2.5	2.1	2.8	2.6	2.0
purse snatching	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.9	1.2	0.7	1.0
pocket picking	1.5	1.6	1.9	1.3	1.5	1.9	1.0
Personal larceny without contact	78.7	81.9	84.5	80.5	77.5	76.7	72.0
<u>25-34</u>							
<u>Crimes of Violence</u>	43.8	39.9	42.0	40.6	39.2	38.6	36.0
Rape	1.3	1.1	0.9	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.0
Robbery	6.0	5.9	6.3	6.4	6.3	7.0	6.0
Assault	36.6	33.0	34.8	33.0	31.7	30.2	29.0
<u>Crimes of Theft</u>	107.7	117.0	114.7	113.2	109.8	106.2	100.0
Personal larceny with contact	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.6	3.0
purse snatching	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.6	1.0
pocket picking	1.9	2.1	1.7	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Personal larceny without contact	104.7	114.2	112.0	110.4	106.9	103.5	97.0

<u>20-24</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1973</u>
<u>Crimes of Violence</u>	72.2	66.9	63.3	53.5	59.2	61.1	64.0
Rape	2.6	2.4	1.7	2.6	2.6	2.1	3.0
Robbery	12.1	8.7	9.1	10.3	10.8	10.7	11.0
Assault	57.5	55.8	52.5	45.6	45.8	48.3	50.0
<u>Crimes of Theft</u>	148.8	152.4	153.9	146.3	146.6	146.3	137.0
Personal larceny with contact	4.3	4.9	3.5	3.8	4.3	3.4	5.0
purse snatching	1.0	1.3	0.8	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.0
pocket picking	3.3	3.5	2.7	2.7	3.3	2.4	3.0
Personal larceny without contact	144.5	147.5	150.4	142.4	142.2	143.0	132.0
<u>16-19</u>							
<u>Crimes of Violence</u>	70.2	68.9	67.7	66.7	64.2	67.9	68.0
Rape	3.2	2.5	2.7	2.1	2.4	2.5	3.0
Robbery	10.4	9.8	9.5	9.4	10.6	11.3	10.0
Assault	56.7	56.6	55.5	55.3	51.1	54.1	55.0
<u>Crimes of Theft</u>	146.1	152.6	149.8	147.0	162.1	159.8	169.0
Personal larceny with contact	2.7	2.9	2.7	4.1	3.3	3.7	4.0
purse snatching	0.9	0.5	0.4*	0.7	0.8	0.6*	1.0
pocket picking	1.8	2.4	2.3	3.4	2.5	3.1	3.0
Personal larceny without contact	143.4	149.7	147.0	142.9	158.8	156.1	164.0
<u>12-15</u>							
<u>Crimes of Violence</u>	53.4	57.0	56.5	52.0	54.6	52.6	60.0
Rape	1.3	1.3	1.6	1.1	0.8	1.5	1.0
Robbery	9.4	10.9	10.9	10.0	11.4	12.7	12.0
Assault	42.7	44.7	44.0	40.9	42.4	38.5	47.0
<u>Crimes of Theft</u>	141.9	145.6	144.2	148.7	158.3	166.7	176.0

<u>12-15</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1973</u>
Personal larceny							
with contact	2.9	1.9	2.3	2.2	3.0	3.1	2.0
purse snatching	0.2*	0.2	0.2*	0.1*	0.1*	0.4*	1.0
pocket picking	2.7	1.7	2.1	2.2	2.8	2.7	1.0
Personal larceny							
without contact	139.0	143.8	141.9	146.5	155.4	163.6	174.0

2 represents less than 0.5

*Estimate statistically unreliable

Source: U.S. Department of Justice (1976, 1977a, 1977b, 1978, 1979, 1980a, 1981: Tables 2 and 4).

Appendix B

Household Crimes: Victimization Rates by Type of Crime and Age
of Head of Household, 1973-1979
(rates per 1,000 households)

<u>All Ages</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1973</u>
Burglary	84.1	86.0	88.5	88.9	91.5	92.6	93.0
Household larceny	133.7	119.9	123.3	124.1	125.2	123.4	109.0
Motor vehicle theft	17.5	17.5	17.0	16.5	19.4	18.7	19.0
<u>65 & Over</u>							
Burglary	45.0	45.2	49.7	50.2	53.8	54.5	55.0
Household larceny	57.5	53.6	57.4	59.5	58.7	57.9	48.0
Motor vehicle theft	5.0	5.2	3.8	6.1	6.2	5.7	5.0
<u>50-64</u>							
Burglary	64.5	66.3	69.6	67.5	68.1	69.0	72.0
Household larceny	103.8	87.8	95.4	94.6	94.1	88.9	85.0
Motor vehicle theft	14.5	15.4	15.1	12.3	14.9	14.2	16.0
<u>35-49</u>							
Burglary	93.3	93.2	91.9	92.8	101.4	99.0	101.0
Household larceny	156.9	141.9	143.8	144.7	149.0	145.9	128.0
Motor vehicle theft	20.9	19.3	20.2	18.9	21.7	20.8	21.0
<u>20-34</u>							
Burglary	111.5	115.8	120.0	123.6	122.0	127.3	123.0
Household larceny	182.8	166.2	169.4	171.9	171.4	174.2	151.0
Motor vehicle theft	24.3	24.3	24.1	24.3	29.6	27.8	29.0
<u>12-19</u>							
Burglary	222.5	246.6	234.6	207.3	214.2	217.3	219.0
Household larceny	258.9	239.4	193.5	178.1	221.6	204.8	209.0
Motor vehicle theft	42.8	52.6	26.3	27.4	32.7	54.0	39.0

Source: U.S. Department of Justice (1976, 1977a, 1977b, 1978, 1979, 1980a, 1981).