

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

IN SEARCH OF SECURITY: A NATIONAL
PERSPECTIVE ON ELDERLY CRIME
VICTIMIZATION

REPORT

BY THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND CONSUMER
INTERESTS

OF THE
SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING

(TOGETHER WITH ADDITIONAL VIEWS)

NINETY-FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

NCJRS

APR 1977



EDITION

APRIL 1977

COMM. PUB. NO. 95-87

Printed for the use of the Select Committee on Aging

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1977

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

42302

SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING

CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida, *Chairman*

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| EDWARD R. ROYBAL, California | BOB WILSON, California, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i> |
| FRED B. ROONEY, Pennsylvania | WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia |
| MARIO BIAGGI, New York | JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas |
| WALTER FLOWERS, Alabama | WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine |
| IKE F. ANDREWS, North Carolina | RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut |
| JOHN L. BURTON, California | WILLIAM F. WALSH, New York |
| EDWARD P. BEARD, Rhode Island | CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa |
| MICHAEL T. BLOUIN, Iowa | JAMES ABDNOR, South Dakota |
| DON BONKER, Washington | THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi |
| THOMAS J. DOWNEY, New York | MATTHEW J. RINALDO, New Jersey |
| JAMES J. FLORIO, New Jersey | MARC L. MARKS, Pennsylvania |
| HAROLD E. FORD, Tennessee | |
| WILLIAM J. HUGHES, New Jersey | |
| MARILYN LLOYD, Tennessee | |
| JIM SANTINI, Nevada | |
| TED RISENHOOVER, Oklahoma | |
| ROBERT F. DRINAN, Massachusetts | |
| DAVID W. EVANS, Indiana | |
| HELEN S. MEYNER, New Jersey | |
| MARTY RUSSO, Illinois | |
| STANLEY N. LUNDINE, New York | |
| MARY ROSE OAKAR, Ohio | |

ROBERT S. WEINER, *Staff Director*
JAMES A. BRENNAN, *Assistant to the Chairman*
EDWARD F. HOWARD, *General Counsel*
ROBETTA BRETSCH, *Minority Staff Director*

(II)

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

(CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida, *Chairman of the full committee*, and BOB WILSON, *Ranking Minority Member*, are members of all subcommittees, ex officio.)

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 1—RETIREMENT INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT

FRED B. ROONEY, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| WALTER FLOWERS, Alabama | WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i> |
| JOHN L. BURTON, California | CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa |
| DON BONKER, Washington | THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi |
| THOMAS J. DOWNEY, New York | |
| DAVID W. EVANS, Indiana | |
| MARY ROSE OAKAR, Ohio | |
| JAMES J. FLORIO, New Jersey | |

MARY C. McDONNELL, *Majority Staff Director*
NANCY E. HOBBS, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 2—HEALTH AND LONG-TERM CARE

CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida, *Chairman*

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| IKE F. ANDREWS, North Carolina | WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i> |
| EDWARD P. BEARD, Rhode Island | MARC L. MARKS, Pennsylvania |
| HAROLD E. FORD, Tennessee | |
| MARILYN LLOYD, Tennessee | |
| ROBERT F. DRINAN, Massachusetts | |
| STANLEY N. LUNDINE, New York | |

LOUISE BRACKNELL, *Majority Staff Director*
CYNTHIA HILTON, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 3—HOUSING AND CONSUMER INTERESTS

EDWARD R. ROYBAL, California, *Chairman*

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| JIM SANTINI, Nevada | JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i> |
| TED RISENHOOVER, Oklahoma | WILLIAM F. WALSH, New York |
| ROBERT F. DRINAN, Massachusetts | MATTHEW J. RINALDO, New Jersey |
| DAVID W. EVANS, Indiana | |
| STANLEY N. LUNDINE, New York | |
| MARY ROSE OAKAR, Ohio | |
| MARIO BIAGGI, New York | |

JOSÉ GARZA, *Majority Staff Director*
PATRICIA C. LAWRENCE, *Minority Staff Director*
MELISSA POLLAK, *Research Assistant*

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 4—FEDERAL, STATE, AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MARIO BIAGGI, New York, *Chairman*

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| WILLIAM J. HUGHES, New Jersey | BOB WILSON, California, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i> |
| MICHAEL T. BLOUIN, Iowa | RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut |
| JAMES J. FLORIO, New Jersey | JAMES ABDNOR, South Dakota |
| HELEN S. MEYNER, New Jersey | |
| MARTY RUSSO, Illinois | |

ROBERT B. BLANCATO, *Majority Staff Director*
THOMAS F. McDONALD, Ph. D., *Minority Staff Director*

(III)

FOREWORD

The Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests undertook the study of criminal victimization of the elderly in response to the anxiety expressed by numerous older Americans across the nation.

The major purpose of this report is to determine the national scope of crime against the elderly and to distinguish the difference between fear of crime and actual rates of victimization. The subcommittee realizes that this report is only the first step toward developing a comprehensive policy for reducing elderly crime victimization.

The intent of the study was threefold: (1) to determine whether or not the elderly are disproportionately the victims of crime; (2) to provide information on elderly crime victimization programs for those agencies, organizations, or individuals who are considering the establishment of prevention programs; and (3) to discuss techniques and concepts for strengthening residences and neighborhoods in order to prevent victimization.

The data used in the report were gathered from various sources. Much of it came from subcommittee hearings and surveys. In addition, a survey of available literature was undertaken. This included information from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and studies conducted by independent researchers. Finally, consultations were held with various experts on the subject.

We are grateful for the efforts of Dr. Arthur H. Patterson, Assistant Professor, College of Human Development, Pennsylvania State University, who read the report and made valuable suggestions which were incorporated into the report; and George Gerharz, Research Coordinator, Planning and Research, Community Relations-Social Development Commission, Milwaukee, Wis., who provided technical assistance in the development of the report's recommendations.

EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests,
Select Committee on Aging.*

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Foreword..... | v |
| The Problem: An Assessment..... | 1 |
| Federal Bureau of Investigation..... | 1 |
| Law Enforcement Assistance Administration..... | 3 |
| Subcommittee analysis of LEAA surveys..... | 10 |
| Independent crime studies..... | 12 |
| New York, N. Y..... | 12 |
| Oakland, Calif..... | 13 |
| Wilmington, Del..... | 13 |
| Detroit, Mich..... | 13 |
| Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif..... | 14 |
| Houston, Tex..... | 14 |
| Texas..... | 15 |
| Boston, Mass..... | 15 |
| Kansas City, Mo..... | 16 |
| Subcommittee survey..... | 17 |
| "At Risk" and underreporting problems..... | 17 |
| Summary..... | 19 |
| A Profile of the Victim and the Offender..... | 21 |
| Victim..... | 21 |
| Wilmington, Del..... | 21 |
| Detroit, Mich..... | 21 |
| Houston, Tex..... | 21 |
| Kansas City, Mo..... | 23 |
| Boston, Mass..... | 26 |
| Conditions increasing the elderly's vulnerability..... | 26 |
| Economic factors..... | 26 |
| Physical factors..... | 27 |
| Environmental factors..... | 27 |
| Social factors..... | 28 |
| Psychological factors—fear of crime..... | 28 |
| Offender..... | 28 |
| Boston, Mass..... | 28 |
| Wilmington, Del..... | 29 |
| Detroit, Mich..... | 29 |
| Houston, Tex..... | 29 |
| Kansas City, Mo..... | 29 |
| Subcommittee findings..... | 33 |
| Fear and Its Consequences..... | 38 |
| Variables that affect fear..... | 41 |
| Sex..... | 41 |
| Economics..... | 41 |
| Race..... | 42 |
| Community..... | 42 |
| Results of fear of crime and/or victimization..... | 44 |
| Morale and environment..... | 46 |
| Local Crime Prevention Programs..... | 47 |
| Education and training programs..... | 48 |
| Community cohesion through locally based crime prevention programs..... | 52 |
| Supportive services programs..... | 58 |
| Victim assistance programs..... | 62 |
| Treatment of the offender or potential offender..... | 63 |

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Residential Security..... | 68 |
| Securing the home..... | 71 |
| Defensible space..... | 73 |
| Neighborhood reclamation..... | 77 |
| Recommendations..... | 81 |
| Legislative recommendations..... | 81 |
| Recommendations to Federal agencies..... | 85 |
| Department of Housing and Urban Development..... | 85 |
| Law Enforcement Assistance Administration..... | 86 |
| Administration on Aging..... | 87 |
| Recommendations to local units of Government..... | 87 |
| Other recommendations to Congress..... | 88 |
| Additional views: Representative Mario Biaggi..... | 89 |

IN SEARCH OF SECURITY: A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON ELDERLY CRIME VICTIMIZATION

THE PROBLEM: AN ASSESSMENT

This report on the relationship of crime to older Americans was undertaken for the following reasons:

1. To attempt to validate the scope and nature of the problem from a national point of view;
2. To explore and account for the divergencies in previous statistical studies; and
3. To review current programs impacting on the issue.

The 1970's have brought a growing interest in the problems of the elderly. Although there is often controversy about how to redress problems such as insufficient income, inadequate housing, costly medical services, and lack of transportation, no one debates whether or not these are legitimate issues. Crime against the elderly has also received growing study and notoriety. The press, the criminal justice system, the political systems, academicians, and senior citizen organizations have all been concerned and involved in the issue. The results of their reports, studies, and surveys have been diverse and often contradictory. This report was undertaken in an attempt to ascertain the validity of the problem.

A major concern of the investigation was to determine, in light of this controversy, whether or not elderly people are disproportionately victims of crimes. Information for each position comes from:

1. Studies and surveys conducted by the United States Justice Department;
2. Academic researchers in fields such as gerontology, criminology, urban planning, and the behavioral sciences;
3. Social service agencies and national organizations involved in services to the elderly;
4. Systematic review of the literature;
5. Congressional hearings held by the subcommittee;
6. Responses of chiefs of police to a questionnaire developed by the subcommittee;¹ and
7. Responses of State attorneys general to inquiries from the subcommittee.²

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The first task of this study, therefore, was to assess the actual rate of victimization of the elderly in the United States. Statistics on the incidence of crime in the nation have been compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) since 1930. The FBI statistics are

¹ A questionnaire was sent by the subcommittee to a random sample of 50 chiefs of police throughout the country.

² A letter was sent by the subcommittee to the 50 State attorneys general requesting information on crime prevention programs in their States and soliciting information on victim compensation.

based upon the number of crimes reported annually to the Bureau by 9,160 state and local law enforcement agencies. It is generally recognized that they are subject to statistical inaccuracies due to the facts that:

1. They measure only seven categories of crime—murder, forcible rape, aggravated assault, robbery, larceny-theft, burglary, and motor vehicle theft;
2. They measure only reported incidents of crime; and
3. The crime reporting systems of local police departments vary from stringent to casual, making comparisons between cities difficult.

Although the FBI does record data on the perpetrators of crimes (age, sex, and race), it does not record the age of the victim. The need for this information has been brought to the attention of the Bureau. Clarence Kelley, Director of the FBI, testified on this issue before the subcommittee on April 13, 1976, in Washington, D.C.:

Mr. ROYBAL. One of the interesting points that you brought out is the fact that police departments throughout the country have statistics on the subject but not the victim. What is the case with regard to the FBI? What kind of data do you collect and what can be made available to this subcommittee with regard to that data?

Mr. KELLEY. We do not ourselves have the capability of adding to the statistics which are sent to us by the local law enforcement agencies, so we have no control over them whatsoever.

The only way this can be ascertained is through the local department itself which may choose to maintain this record. It is not required in what we call our uniform crime reporting system. Our uniform crime reporting system asks for age, sex, and race information about the person arrested.

To add statistics on the victim would be quite an extension and quite expensive, affecting both the police department and our record system.

Mr. ROYBAL. I don't understand how it would be expensive.

Mr. KELLEY. Just the time consumed in developing all this information.

Mr. ROYBAL. But in a report that is made, a police department could very well ask the age of the victim. Couldn't that be part of the statistics that would later be used to show that a particular kind of crime was committed against them?

Mr. KELLEY. It is just the time that it takes plus the recording. Strangely enough, there are also some objections that are voiced against this by the victims themselves. You find many victims who are reluctant to give their age, for example. Many times they protest about this, saying, "I can't understand why you want to know what my age is. Why don't you get the age of that subject? Why don't you chase him? Why do you spend time with me?"

Although it is a method of compiling some useful data, nonetheless it is expensive and it does cause some problems.³

The subcommittee's questionnaire revealed that many local police departments are recording the age of the victim. In a selected sample, 50 chiefs of police were mailed a questionnaire regarding crime and the elderly. Thirty-seven of the fifty forms were returned. One question asked, "Do you record the age of the victim when filling out your crime reports?" On 27 of the 37 forms it was answered "yes." It is clear from the sample that this data is already being compiled by many police departments. If the FBI wanted data on the victim, it is unlikely that local police departments would fail to comply with that request. To the subcommittee's knowledge, there is no effort being made to correct this condition by including the age of the victim in the FBI Uniform Crime Report.

³ See pp. 30 and 31 of hearing, "Elderly Crime Victimization (Federal Law Enforcement Agencies—LEAA and FBI)," held before the Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests of the House Select Committee on Aging, Apr. 12 and 13, 1976.

The FBI is the Federal agency mandated to gather national crime statistics.⁴ Important policy decisions are based upon its data. The subcommittee feels that a major stumbling block in its investigation and that of other researchers comes from insufficient data, especially on elderly victims.

The Justice Department wants to relieve the FBI of this responsibility and create a centralized office of national crime statistics under the control of the Attorney General.⁵ At present there are 53 statistical programs scattered throughout the Department and other Federal law enforcement agencies. A consolidation into one "Bureau of Criminal Justice Statistics" would be valuable.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

In 1968 the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) was added to the Department of Justice. It was created to assist and supplement local law enforcement agencies. One of its functions is to conduct studies and gather data on the incidence of crime. LEAA utilizes a survey⁶ method for data collection, unlike the FBI's method of relying on incidents reported to the police. Its statistics on the extent of crime vary considerably from the FBI Uniform Crime Reports. One of its findings reveals that the number of unreported crimes is twice the amount reported to the police.

The National Crime Panel of LEAA has undertaken five surveys on criminal victimization in the United States.⁷ These reports constitute the most extensive attempt to document the risk of being victimized that different groups in our society encounter. The crimes which are measured are those considered most serious by the general public and those which lend themselves to measurement by the survey method.⁸ For individuals, these are: rape, robbery, assault, and personal larceny; for households: burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft.

The victimization rates derived from the national study reveal that the elderly are victims of violent crimes at a rate of 8 per 1,000 population, while the rate for the general population is 32 per 1,000 population. For crimes of theft, the elderly are victimized at a rate of 22 per 1,000 as compared to 91 per 1,000 for the general population. In household crimes, the elderly experience victimization rates of 107 per 1,000 households while the general population has a rate of 217 per 1,000 households. Therefore, according to the survey data, national victimization rates are lower for the elderly than for the general population.

⁴ Preliminary figures for 1976 issued by the FBI reveal a decrease in violent crime in the nation but an increase in property crimes. This may indicate a subsequent increase of crimes perpetrated against older Americans.

⁵ From article by John M. Goshko, Washington Post, Oct. 12, 1976, p. A1.

⁶ The survey consists of a representative probability sampling of households and commercial establishments. It has two main elements—a continuous national survey and surveys taken periodically in selected central cities. The surveys are designed and conducted for the LEAA by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

⁷ Victimization surveys: "Criminal Victimization in the United States: 1973 Advance Report;" "Crimes and Victims: A Report on the Dayton-San Jose Pilot Survey of Victimization;" "Criminal Victimization Surveys in the Nation's Five Largest Cities: National Crime Panel Surveys in Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York, and Philadelphia;" "Crime in Eight American Cities: National Crime Panel Surveys in Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Newark, Portland, and St. Louis—Advance Report;" and "Criminal Victimization Surveys in 13 American Cities: National Crime Panel Surveys in Boston, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Houston, Miami, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oakland, Pittsburgh, San Diego, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C."

⁸ The category of murder cannot be included because the victims cannot be surveyed.

TABLE I.—PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD CRIMES: VICTIMIZATION RATES FOR THE GENERAL AND ELDERLY POPULATIONS, UNITED STATES, 1973

| Type of crime | Rate for the general population | Rate for the elderly population |
|--|--|--|
| | Based on 1,000 persons age 12 and over | Based on 1,000 persons age 65 and over |
| Personal crimes: | | |
| Crimes of violence ¹ | 32 | 8 |
| Robbery..... | 7 | 5 |
| Robbery with injury..... | 2 | 2 |
| Robbery without injury..... | 4 | 3 |
| Assault..... | 25 | 3 |
| Aggravated assault..... | 10 | 1 |
| Simple assault..... | 15 | 2 |
| Crimes of theft..... | 91 | 22 |
| Personal larceny with contact ² | 3 | 3 |
| Personal larceny without contact..... | 88 | 19 |
| | Based on 1,000 households headed by persons age 12 and over | Based on 1,000 households headed by persons age 65 and over |
| Household crimes: | | |
| Burglary..... | 91 | 55 |
| Household larceny..... | 107 | 47 |
| Motor vehicle theft..... | 19 | 5 |

¹ Includes data on rape, not shown separately.
² Includes purse snatching and pocket picking.⁹

Note: Detail may not add to total shown because of rounding.

In the three surveys, "Criminal Victimization Surveys in the Nation's Five Largest Cities," "Crime in Eight American Cities," and "Criminal Victimization Surveys in 13 American Cities"⁹ (hereafter to be referred to as the "city" studies), LEAA included an analysis of victimization by age. These surveys also indicate that the elderly are not disproportionately victimized. The subcommittee believes that the general figures mask certain crime categories in which the elderly experience high victimization rates. According to "Criminal Victimization Surveys in the Nation's Five Largest Cities," the elderly have the highest rate of larceny with contact in four out of the five cities. In "Crime in Eight American Cities," it is revealed that while the victimization rate for the general population for personal larceny with contact is 317 per 100,000, the rate for those 50-64 is 342 per 100,000 and 362 per 100,000 for those 65 and older. In three of the eight cities, robbery with injury was highest for those 50 and above—except for persons under 20 years of age.¹⁰

The victimization rates for burglary are substantially higher than those for personal larceny with contact: 5,526 per 100,000 households for those 65 years old and above and 7,188 per 100,000 households for those 50-64 years of age. Although these figures are lower than the 9,267 per 100,000 households for the total population, this shows a very substantial number of elderly persons being burglarized.

Although the elderly appear to be less victimized in most of the crime categories of the LEAA survey than persons in younger age groups, this is just one way of viewing the data. Another way to utilize the data is to examine the raw figures. In the subcommittee hearing held on April 12, 1976, in Washington, D.C., Henry F. Me-

⁹ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Federal Law Enforcement Agencies—LEAA and FBI)," p. 4.

¹⁰ U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, "Criminal Victimization in Eight American Cities," April 1975, p. 431.

Quade, Deputy Administrator for Policy Development of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, provided the following figures:¹¹

1. In crimes of violence, the elderly experience 8 victimizations per 1,000 population;
 2. In crimes of theft, 22 victimizations per 1,000 population; and
 3. In household crimes, 107 victimizations per 1,000 population.
- If the elderly population at that time was approximately 20 million, in a 1-year period, the elderly experienced 160,000 violent crimes, 440,000 crimes of theft, and 2,140,000 household crimes. Combining these figures, one finds that the elderly experienced 2,740,000 per 20 million population. This means that an elderly person stands a little better than one chance in ten of being the victim of a crime in a 1-year period.

Another valuable use of these data is a comparison of the victimization rates of the elderly for consecutive years to determine any changes over time. The report, "Criminal Victimization in the United States: A Comparison of 1973 and 1974," states that Americans 65 years of age and older experienced the greatest overall increase in crimes of violence (except for males 16-19). There was a 46 percent increase in assault during that 1-year period. Although robbery for males without injury decreased 28.4 percent, robbery with injury for males increased 25.4 percent, personal larceny with contact increased 14.4 percent and personal larceny without contact increased 11.2 percent for females. In the aggregate figure for crimes of violence for both sexes, there is a 6.5 percent increase between 1973 and 1974 (males 10.9, females 1.8). The aggregate figure for crimes of theft shows a decrease of 1.9 percent. This figure is deceiving, however, because a breakdown by sex shows that although males have experienced a decrease of 14.3 percent, theft against females increased by 11.7 percent. In fact, the increase in theft for females 65 and older is higher than for any age group in the survey.

The most significant decreases have been robbery for females 65 and over (30.8 percent) and crimes of theft for males 65 and over (14.3 percent). (See Table II, on pages 6 and 7 for (A) BOTH SEXES, (B) MALES, and (C) FEMALES.)

¹¹ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Federal Law Enforcement Agencies—LEAA and FBI)," p. 3.

TABLE II.—PERSONAL CRIMES: CHANGE IN VICTIMIZATION RATES FOR PERSONS AGE 12 AND OVER, BY SEX, AGE, AND TYPE OF CRIME, 1973 AND 1974¹²

[Rate per 1,000 persons in each age group]

| Sex and age | Number of persons in the group | Crimes of violence | Rape | Robbery | | | Assault | | | Personal larceny | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------|---------|-------------|----------------|---------|------------|--------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | | | | Total | With injury | Without injury | Total | Aggravated | Simple | Crimes of theft | With contact | Without contact |
| (A) BOTH SEXES: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 162,183,000 | 32.3 | 0.9 | 6.7 | 2.3 | 4.4 | 24.7 | 10.0 | 14.7 | 91.0 | 3.1 | 88.0 |
| 1974 rate..... | 164,562,000 | 32.8 | 1.0 | 7.1 | 2.3 | 4.8 | 24.7 | 10.3 | 14.4 | 94.9 | 3.1 | 91.8 |
| Percent change..... | | +1.5 | +4.3 | +6.4 | +4 | +9.6 | +1.1 | +3.3 | -2.2 | +4.2 | +1.6 | +4.3 |
| 12 to 15: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 16,575,000 | 55.3 | .8 | 11.3 | 2.9 | 8.4 | 43.3 | 15.1 | 28.1 | 172.0 | 2.2 | 169.8 |
| 1974 rate..... | 16,527,000 | 52.6 | 1.5 | 12.7 | 3.3 | 9.4 | 38.5 | 12.9 | 25.6 | 166.7 | 3.1 | 163.6 |
| Percent change..... | | -4.9 | +90.9 | +12.1 | +14.5 | +11.4 | -11.1 | -15.0 | -8.9 | -3.1 | +43.3 | -3.7 |
| 16 to 19: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 15,577,000 | 61.5 | 2.3 | 9.3 | 3.1 | 6.2 | 49.8 | 23.3 | 26.6 | 161.4 | 4.3 | 157.1 |
| 1974 rate..... | 15,792,000 | 67.9 | 2.5 | 11.3 | 3.5 | 7.8 | 54.1 | 23.7 | 30.4 | 159.8 | 3.7 | 156.1 |
| Percent change..... | | +10.4 | +6.9 | +21.2 | +11.9 | +25.7 | +8.6 | +2.1 | +14.3 | -1.0 | -14.4 | -6 |
| 20 to 24: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 17,316,000 | 64.0 | 3.3 | 11.3 | 4.1 | 7.2 | 49.5 | 20.9 | 28.6 | 133.4 | 4.6 | 128.8 |
| 1974 rate..... | 17,609,000 | 61.1 | 2.1 | 10.7 | 3.3 | 7.4 | 48.3 | 22.0 | 26.3 | 146.3 | 3.4 | 143.0 |
| Percent change..... | | -4.6 | -36.5 | -5.0 | -19.5 | +3.4 | -2.4 | +5.4 | -8.1 | +3.7 | -26.4 | +11.0 |
| 25 to 34: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 28,128,000 | 34.4 | 1.3 | 5.5 | 1.8 | 3.6 | 27.6 | 11.7 | 15.1 | 99.0 | 2.7 | 96.3 |
| 1974 rate..... | 29,211,000 | 38.6 | 1.4 | 7.0 | 2.1 | 5.0 | 30.2 | 12.6 | 17.7 | 106.2 | 2.6 | 103.5 |
| Percent change..... | | +12.4 | +6.3 | +28.8 | +13.7 | +36.4 | +9.4 | +12.4 | +7.4 | +7.2 | -3.3 | +7.5 |
| 35 to 49: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 33,833,000 | 21.4 | 3.2 | 5.1 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 16.2 | 6.6 | 9.5 | 71.7 | 2.0 | 69.7 |
| 1974 rate..... | 33,783,000 | 20.8 | 3.2 | 5.5 | 2.1 | 3.4 | 15.2 | 7.0 | 8.2 | 79.2 | 2.6 | 76.7 |
| Percent change..... | | -2.7 | +10.5 | +8.3 | +3.0 | +11.8 | -6.3 | +5.4 | -14.5 | +10.6 | +31.3 | +10.0 |
| 50 to 64: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 30,487,000 | 13.0 | 3.1 | 4.4 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 8.5 | 2.7 | 5.9 | 46.7 | 3.4 | 43.3 |
| 1974 rate..... | 30,847,000 | 11.8 | 3 | 4.1 | 1.5 | 2.6 | 7.5 | 2.7 | 4.6 | 49.4 | 3.5 | 45.9 |
| Percent change..... | | -9.6 | +371.4 | -6.6 | -14.0 | -2.2 | -14.2 | +2.6 | -21.7 | +3.7 | +1.2 | +6.0 |
| 65 and over: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 20,267,000 | 8.4 | 3.1 | 5.0 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 22.3 | 3.3 | 19.1 |
| 1974 rate..... | 20,792,000 | 9.0 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 4.9 | 1.6 | 3.4 | 21.9 | 3.4 | 18.5 |
| Percent change..... | | +6.5 | +66.7 | -21.6 | +3.8 | -36.7 | +46.0 | -16.2 | +45.9 | -1.9 | +5.5 | -3.2 |
| (B) MALES: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 77,128,000 | 44.1 | 3.1 | 9.9 | 3.3 | 6.7 | 34.1 | 15.2 | 19.0 | 102.9 | 2.6 | 100.2 |
| 1974 rate..... | 78,194,000 | 45.1 | 3.2 | 10.3 | 3.3 | 7.9 | 34.9 | 16.9 | 18.8 | 108.7 | 3.0 | 105.7 |
| Percent change..... | | +2.3 | -20.0 | +3.6 | +1.5 | +14.8 | +2.3 | +11.3 | -8 | +5.7 | +12.1 | +5.5 |
| 12 to 15: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 8,425,000 | 74.2 | 3.2 | 19.1 | 6.1 | 14.0 | 58.3 | 20.7 | 34.1 | 185.2 | 2.2 | 183.0 |
| 1974 rate..... | 8,384,000 | 69.2 | 3.3 | 20.0 | 6.1 | 14.9 | 58.0 | 19.9 | 29.9 | 177.2 | 4.0 | 173.2 |
| Percent change..... | | -6.7 | +17.4 | +4.7 | 0 | +6.4 | -0.5 | -4.0 | -14.7 | -4.3 | +81.0 | -5.3 |
| 16 to 19: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 7,717,000 | 84.1 | 0 | 14.2 | 4.2 | 10.9 | 70.9 | 37.6 | 32.4 | 184.1 | 5.0 | 179.0 |
| 1974 rate..... | 7,777,000 | 93.5 | 0 | 17.3 | 5.6 | 11.7 | 76.2 | 37.1 | 39.1 | 183.6 | 4.4 | 179.2 |
| Percent change..... | | +11.1 | 0 | +21.9 | +34.5 | +16.7 | +8.9 | +1.2 | +20.6 | -3 | -13.5 | +1 |
| 20 to 24: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 8,305,000 | 84.1 | 3.1 | 11.2 | 5.5 | 11.7 | 66.3 | 30.6 | 36.1 | 154.9 | 4.6 | 150.3 |
| 1974 rate..... | 8,452,000 | 87.2 | 0 | 10.5 | 5.1 | 11.3 | 71.8 | 36.6 | 35.2 | 173.2 | 2.7 | 170.5 |
| Percent change..... | | +3.8 | -100.0 | -6.5 | -26.1 | -3.5 | +7.6 | +19.6 | -2.6 | +11.8 | -41.7 | +13.5 |
| 25 to 34: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 13,699,000 | 45.9 | 3.1 | 7.0 | 2.0 | 5.1 | 38.8 | 16.9 | 21.9 | 112.1 | 2.0 | 110.2 |
| 1974 rate..... | 14,213,000 | 49.9 | 3.1 | 9.0 | 2.4 | 6.5 | 40.8 | 18.3 | 22.5 | 123.1 | 3.4 | 119.7 |
| Percent change..... | | +8.9 | +23.6 | +24.3 | +22.3 | +21.0 | +5.5 | +8.5 | +5.1 | +9.8 | +71.4 | +8.7 |
| 35 to 49: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 16,279,000 | 27.2 | 0 | 7.0 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 26.2 | 3.9 | 11.2 | 74.1 | 1.1 | 73.0 |
| 1974 rate..... | 16,257,000 | 27.5 | 0 | 7.5 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 19.5 | 9.5 | 10.1 | 84.2 | 2.6 | 81.6 |
| Percent change..... | | +2 | 0 | +8.3 | -3.8 | +18.9 | -26.0 | +6.6 | -10.0 | +13.7 | +140.0 | +11.8 |
| 50 to 64: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 14,329,000 | 18.8 | 0 | 6.5 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 12.3 | 4.4 | 5.9 | 48.0 | 2.8 | 45.3 |
| 1974 rate..... | 14,546,000 | 15.8 | 0 | 5.4 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 10.4 | 3.9 | 5.5 | 54.7 | 2.0 | 52.7 |
| Percent change..... | | -16.1 | 0 | -17.5 | -8.3 | -22.6 | -15.3 | -11.1 | -7.5 | +13.9 | -26.1 | +16.3 |
| 65 and over: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 8,374,000 | 10.7 | 5 | 5.9 | 2.8 | 4.1 | 4.8 | 1.3 | 3.5 | 28.4 | 2.8 | 25.6 |
| 1974 rate..... | 8,565,000 | 11.9 | 0 | 5.2 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 6.7 | 2.1 | 4.6 | 24.3 | 2.5 | 21.8 |
| Percent change..... | | +10.9 | 0 | -12.2 | +25.4 | -28.1 | +39.2 | +59.9 | +31.3 | -14.3 | -11.2 | -14.7 |
| (C) FEMALES: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 85,056,000 | 21.6 | 1.8 | 3.8 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 16.1 | 5.2 | 10.9 | 80.3 | 3.4 | 76.8 |
| 1974 rate..... | 86,368,000 | 21.7 | 1.8 | 4.3 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 15.6 | 5.2 | 10.4 | 82.3 | 3.2 | 79.1 |
| Percent change..... | | +2 | +4.2 | +13.3 | -7 | +22.4 | -3.4 | -1.9 | -4.2 | +2.6 | -5.8 | +2.9 |
| 12 to 15: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 8,151,000 | 35.8 | 1.3 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 31.3 | 9.3 | 22.0 | 158.3 | 2.1 | 156.2 |
| 1974 rate..... | 8,143,000 | 35.6 | 2.7 | 5.2 | 1.5 | 2.6 | 27.7 | 6.4 | 21.3 | 155.8 | 2.2 | 153.6 |
| Percent change..... | | -8 | +102.2 | +58.6 | +132.8 | +4.2 | -11.4 | -31.0 | -3.1 | -1.6 | +3.3 | -1.7 |
| 16 to 19: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 7,850,000 | 39.7 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 31.1 | 3.2 | 20.9 | 139.1 | 3.6 | 135.5 |
| 1974 rate..... | 8,015,000 | 43.3 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 1.4 | 4.0 | 32.7 | 10.7 | 21.9 | 136.7 | 3.1 | 133.6 |
| Percent change..... | | +9.9 | +5.9 | +20.6 | -31.4 | +63.6 | +8.7 | +16.7 | +5.1 | -1.7 | -15.0 | -1.4 |
| 20 to 24: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 9,011,000 | 45.5 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 33.5 | 16.0 | 21.6 | 113.6 | 4.6 | 109.1 |
| 1974 rate..... | 9,157,000 | 37.0 | 4.0 | 6.4 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 26.6 | 8.6 | 18.0 | 121.5 | 4.0 | 117.5 |
| Percent change..... | | -18.8 | -35.2 | +9.6 | -9.1 | +27.3 | -29.3 | -28.3 | -16.5 | +7.0 | -11.9 | +7.8 |
| 25 to 34: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 14,429,000 | 23.4 | 2.4 | 4.0 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 17.1 | 5.8 | 11.3 | 86.6 | 3.4 | 83.2 |
| 1974 rate..... | 14,998,000 | 27.9 | 2.5 | 5.2 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 20.9 | 7.1 | 13.0 | 90.1 | 1.9 | 88.2 |
| Percent change..... | | +19.1 | +5.8 | +31.2 | +3.5 | +22.0 | +16.7 | +23.6 | +15.2 | +4.0 | -43.6 | +6.0 |
| 35 to 49: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 17,554,000 | 16.1 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 12.5 | 4.4 | 8.0 | 69.4 | 2.7 | 66.7 |
| 1974 rate..... | 17,526,000 | 14.9 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 11.0 | 4.6 | 6.4 | 74.6 | 2.5 | 72.1 |
| Percent change..... | | -7.3 | +10.8 | +8.4 | +22.7 | +2.7 | -11.4 | +3.4 | -20.2 | +7.5 | -9.1 | +8.1 |
| 50 to 64: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 16,158,000 | 7.8 | 3.1 | 5.6 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 5.2 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 45.5 | 4.0 | 41.5 |
| 1974 rate..... | 16,301,000 | 8.2 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 4.7 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 44.6 | 4.8 | 39.8 |
| Percent change..... | | +4.1 | +342.9 | -18.6 | -23.7 | +41.5 | -12.9 | +50.9 | -29.4 | -2.1 | +18.1 | -4.1 |
| 65 and over: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 11,893,000 | 6.9 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 18.1 | 3.6 | 14.5 |
| 1974 rate..... | 12,228,000 | 7.0 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 3.7 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 20.2 | 4.1 | 16.1 |
| Percent change..... | | +1.8 | +5.0 | -27.8 | -9.8 | -46.3 | +55.3 | +29.2 | +71.0 | +11.7 | +14.4 | +11.2 |

¹ Percent change is significant at the 2-standard error or 95-percent confidence level.
² Percent change is significant at the 1.6-standard-error or 99-percent confidence level.

³ Rate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

Finally, another category which demonstrates the dramatic increase in crime against the elderly is household crimes. Persons 65 and older had an increase in more kinds of household crimes (burglary, household larceny, and motor vehicle theft) than any other population group except for the small number of households headed by persons 12 to 19. (See Table III.)

TABLE III.—PERSONAL CRIMES: CHANGE IN VICTIMIZATION RATES FOR PERSONS AGE 12 AND OVER, BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME AND TYPE OF CRIME, 1973 AND 1974¹
 [Rate per 1,000 persons age 12 and over]

| Annual family income | Number of persons in the group | Crimes of violence | Robbery | | | | Assault | | | Personal larceny | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------|-------|-------------|----------------|---------|------------|--------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | | | Rape | Total | With injury | Without injury | Total | Aggravated | Simple | Crimes of theft | With contact | Without contact |
| Total: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 162,183,000 | 32.3 | 0.9 | 6.7 | 2.3 | 4.4 | 24.7 | 10.0 | 14.7 | 91.0 | 3.1 | 88.0 |
| 1974 rate..... | 164,562,000 | 32.8 | 1.0 | 7.1 | 2.3 | 4.8 | 24.7 | 10.3 | 14.4 | 94.9 | 3.1 | 91.8 |
| Percent change..... | | +1.5 | +4.3 | +6.4 | +4 | +9.6 | +0.1 | +3.3 | -2.2 | +4.2 | +1.6 | +4.3 |
| Less than \$3,000: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 15,875,000 | 48.3 | 2.1 | 11.5 | 4.5 | 7.0 | 34.8 | 16.3 | 18.5 | 74.5 | 5.9 | 68.6 |
| 1974 rate..... | 14,461,000 | 54.3 | 3.4 | 11.9 | 5.2 | 6.7 | 38.9 | 16.4 | 22.5 | 80.7 | 5.6 | 75.1 |
| Percent change..... | | +12.3 | +63.6 | +3.7 | +17.0 | -4.7 | +12.0 | +0.9 | +21.3 | +8.2 | -5.7 | +9.4 |
| \$3,000 to \$7,499: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 38,836,000 | 37.8 | 1.4 | 7.5 | 2.5 | 5.1 | 28.9 | 12.6 | 16.3 | 75.3 | 3.6 | 71.7 |
| 1974 rate..... | 37,049,000 | 36.1 | 1.2 | 8.6 | 2.9 | 5.6 | 26.4 | 11.8 | 14.6 | 79.1 | 3.9 | 75.2 |
| Percent change..... | | -4.5 | -11.9 | +13.4 | +18.2 | +11.1 | -8.8 | -6.1 | -13.9 | +5.0 | +9.2 | +4.8 |
| \$7,500 to \$9,999: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 19,991,000 | 30.6 | .6 | 6.2 | 2.4 | 3.8 | 23.8 | 9.5 | 14.4 | 87.7 | 2.6 | 85.1 |
| 1974 rate..... | 18,909,000 | 35.2 | .7 | 7.7 | 2.6 | 5.1 | 26.8 | 12.0 | 14.8 | 94.9 | 3.5 | 91.4 |
| Percent change..... | | +15.0 | +12.7 | +24.4 | +9.2 | +33.9 | +12.5 | +27.3 | +2.8 | +8.3 | +33.2 | +7.5 |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 41,333,000 | 27.3 | .6 | 5.3 | 1.5 | 3.8 | 21.5 | 8.0 | 13.5 | 97.0 | 2.4 | 94.6 |
| 1974 rate..... | 42,037,000 | 27.6 | .5 | 4.8 | 1.3 | 3.5 | 22.3 | 9.4 | 13.0 | 93.9 | 1.9 | 91.9 |
| Percent change..... | | +1.1 | -8.6 | -10.2 | -16.0 | -7.9 | +4.1 | +17.4 | -3.7 | -3.2 | -18.1 | -2.9 |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 27,416,000 | 25.8 | .7 | 5.1 | 1.7 | 3.4 | 20.0 | 6.7 | 13.3 | 111.6 | 1.9 | 109.6 |
| 1974 rate..... | 31,116,000 | 28.0 | .5 | 5.6 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 21.9 | 8.6 | 13.3 | 115.8 | 2.6 | 113.2 |
| Percent change..... | | +8.7 | -32.9 | +10.4 | +1.2 | +15.1 | +9.7 | +29.1 | -.1 | +3.8 | +34.5 | +3.2 |
| \$25,000 and over: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1973 rate..... | 8,777,000 | 25.0 | 4.3 | 5.4 | 1.6 | 3.8 | 19.4 | 6.4 | 13.0 | 128.6 | 3.5 | 125.2 |
| 1974 rate..... | 10,276,000 | 25.3 | 4.6 | 5.9 | 1.5 | 4.4 | 18.9 | 5.6 | 13.3 | 127.7 | 2.7 | 125.0 |
| Percent change..... | | +1.3 | +126.9 | +8.7 | -3.2 | -13.6 | -2.5 | -12.6 | +2.5 | -.7 | -1.7 | -.2 |

¹ Includes data on persons whose income level was not ascertained, not shown separately.
² Percent change is significant at the 2-standard-error or 95-percent confidence level.

³ Percent change is significant at the 1.6-standard-error or 90-percent confidence level.
⁴ Rate, based on about 10 or fewer sample cases, is statistically unreliable.

¹³ Ibid., p. 21.

A number of professionals utilizing the LEAA "cities" studies conclude that the elderly generally have a lower victimization rate in all crime categories other than larceny with contact. Therefore, they have concluded that the elderly do not have a crime problem. The comparative studies (1973 and 1974) and the raw data discussed above do not support that conclusion.

SUBCOMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF LEAA SURVEYS

The subcommittee believes that there are some methodological problems in the LEAA survey data which affect their application to the elderly. These include:

1. *Reporting method.*—The use of an aggregate figure can mask important rates from subsamples and variables which are lost when the data is averaged to form that aggregate. An example of this was found in the LEAA 1973-1974 comparison findings. The aggregate figure cited for crimes of theft showed a decrease of 1.9 percent. When this figure was refined by sex variables, one can see that although males experienced a 14.3 percent decrease, females experienced an 11.7 percent increase in theft. As has been previously mentioned, the increase in theft for females 65 and over is higher than for any other age group in the survey.

2. *Crime categories.*—The elderly by virtue of age, health, and economics are less susceptible to some of LEAA crime categories than the general population, e.g., rape and auto theft. On the other hand, the elderly are considered to be more vulnerable to crimes that were not included,¹⁴ e.g., fraud, bunco,¹⁵ medical quackery, and harassment by teenagers.

3. *Age intervals.*—Every age interval in the survey is a closed interval (e.g., 12-15, 35-49) except that of the elderly. It includes all those 65 and over. This category is too large and undifferentiated. As gerontologists explain, this category includes the young-old, middle-old, and old-old (as distinguished by their health, habits, and lifestyles). Many people in this expanded group are not "at risk" in street crimes since they are too old and frail to leave their residences. Most studies show that crime decreases at the highest end of the aging spectrum. Carl L. Cunningham elaborates on this aspect:

The distribution of victimization over elderly age groups (Table IV) reveals that the youngest (60-64) group suffers the highest overall rates of victimization compared to other age groups. For the three following age groups (65-69, 70-74, 75-79), the combined rate of victimization remains at a relatively stable level and then declines substantially for the oldest group (80 and older). This general trend is somewhat a function of the activity levels of these age groups. The youngest age group (60-64) is more likely to be employed and more mobile. This mobility presents opportunities for victimization that are not as prevalent in the older age groups. For example, because the younger victim is more likely to be employed, he or she will be away from home, which increases the probability of being burglarized. Furthermore, being away from the house the entire work day implies that the employed person will be in situations—on the street, in parking lots—that would increase his or her probability of being robbed or assaulted.¹⁶

¹⁴ From article by Jack Goldsmith and Noel E. Tomas, "Crimes Against the Elderly: A Continuing National Crisis," *Aging*, June/July, 1974, p. 4.
¹⁵ Bunco—L. slang term for confidence games; 2. confidence games include home improvement frauds, fraudulent sales schemes and fraudulent advertisement.—Washington, D.C., Police Department.
¹⁶ Report by Carl L. Cunningham, Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, *Patterns of Crimes Against Older Americans*, Dec. 12, 1975, pp. 49 and 51.

TABLE IV.—TYPE OF CRIME BY AGE OF VICTIM, SEPT. 1, 1972 THROUGH APR. 15, 1975 17

| Type of crime | 60-64 | | 65-69 | | 70-74 | | 75-79 | | 80 or older | | Median age |
|-----------------------|--------|----------------|--------|----------------|--------|----------------|--------|----------------|-------------|----------------|------------|
| | Number | Rate per 1,000 | Number | Rate per 1,000 | |
| Burglary | 592 | 25.86 | 421 | 21.48 | 314 | 19.64 | 226 | 55.3 | 191 | 15.51 | 67.8 |
| Robbery: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Armed | 117 | 5.11 | 71 | 3.62 | 58 | 10.5 | 42 | 10.3 | 30 | 8.7 | 64.5 |
| Strong-arm: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nonpurse snatch | 54 | 2.36 | 40 | 2.04 | 34 | 6.2 | 28 | 6.8 | 27 | 7.9 | 68.2 |
| Purse snatch | 57 | 2.49 | 42 | 2.14 | 40 | 7.3 | 41 | 10.0 | 28 | 8.2 | 70.1 |
| Strong-arm total | 111 | 4.85 | 82 | 4.18 | 74 | 13.5 | 69 | 16.8 | 55 | 16.1 | 69.7 |
| Robbery total | 228 | 9.95 | 133 | 7.90 | 132 | 24.0 | 111 | 27.1 | 85 | 24.8 | 68.6 |
| Larceny, purse snatch | 72 | 3.15 | 54 | 2.76 | 68 | 12.4 | 47 | 11.5 | 31 | 9.0 | 70.2 |
| Assault | 67 | 2.93 | 30 | 1.53 | 20 | 3.6 | 15 | 3.7 | 13 | 3.8 | 65.4 |
| Fraud | 16 | 1.6 | 14 | .71 | 12 | 2.2 | 8 | 2.0 | 17 | 5.0 | 71.0 |
| Homicide | 1 | .04 | 1 | .05 | 2 | .4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.2 | (*) |
| Rape | 3 | .13 | 1 | .05 | 2 | .4 | 2 | .5 | 2 | .6 | (*) |
| All crimes | 979 | 42.77 | 674 | 34.33 | 550 | 100.1 | 409 | 100.1 | 343 | 100.1 | 68.2 |

¹⁷ Crime categories containing fewer than 30 observations should be interpreted cautiously.

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.

17 Ibid., p. 51.

4. *Qualitative vs. quantitative measures.*—Every professional that testified before this subcommittee bore witness to the fact that although there is controversy regarding the quantitative measures of elderly victimization, it is clear that the elderly suffer disproportionately in qualitative measures. Clarence M. Kelley told this subcommittee on April 13, 1976, "Psychologically, financially, and physically, no group of citizens suffers more painful losses than our Nation's elderly do at the hands of America's criminal predators."¹⁸

Mr. McQuade stated on April 12, 1976:

While there may be some uncertainty about crime victimization among senior citizens, there is, I believe, little question about their vulnerability—physical, psychological, and financial.

Take, for example, the instance of the theft of a television set. The effect upon a younger person does not carry the same impact as it does upon a person who is 65 years and older and of limited means.

Take the instance of physical violence. It has a particularly debilitating effect on the older person.

The theft of a social security check has a tremendous impact upon a person of lower income.¹⁹

Mr. George Sunderland, Coordinator of the Crime Prevention Program of the National Retired Teachers Association/American Association of Retired Persons (NRTA/AARP), explained:

Although the incidence of crime has risen throughout society in general, we are finding that crimes against older persons are becoming more prevalent and more frequent. This is particularly important to note because crime impacts most heavily on older persons. Financially and physically, they are least able to cope with the loss or injury resulting from a criminal act. No one would argue that the time has come to give more serious consideration to crimes against the elderly.

I travel across the country, as do all members of my staff.

Last year, I took 56 trips outside of Washington. Every time something is brought to my attention either I go, or a member of my staff goes, to observe it. I do see a change in crimes against the elderly. That is in addition to the economic gain. I see a trend toward unprovoked violence. This concerns me greatly.

For the older victim who quite often has worked all his life and has fallen into the crunch between inflation and reduced fixed income, being criminally victimized is the "last betrayal."²⁰

INDEPENDENT CRIME STUDIES

To further the subcommittee's analysis of criminal victimization of the elderly, a systematic search of the literature was undertaken. The studies conducted by researchers, independent of one another, in diverse sections of the country report findings that are significantly different from those reported by LEAA.

New York, N.Y.

In a study in 1975, it was found that 35 percent of New York City's elderly lived in its 26 poorest neighborhoods and of those interviewed, 40 percent reported being victimized.²¹

David M. Friedman of the Crime Victim's Service Center, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, New York, presented a paper at the National Conference on Crime Against the Elderly in June 1975,

¹⁸ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Federal Law Enforcement Agencies—LEAA and FBI)," p. 24.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

²⁰ See pp. 13 and 17 of hearing, "Elderly Crime Victimization (Crime Prevention Programs)," held before the Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests of the House Select Committee on Aging, Mar. 29, 1976.

²¹ From article by Marjorie Cantor, "Life Space and the Social Support Systems of the Inner City Elderly of New York," *The Gerontologist*, 1975, pp. 23-27.

in Washington, D.C. This paper showed that in 1974 in New York City, women over 65 accounted for 15 percent of homicide victims—highly out of proportion to their percentage of the population.

Oakland, Calif.

In a 3-year study of robbery in Oakland, it was found that although the general population runs the risk of being victimized at the rate of 1 in 146, females over 65 have a victimization rate of 1 in 24.²²

Wilmington, Del.

A study in Wilmington, Del., conducted jointly by the FBI and the police department in 1975 (utilizing the 1970 census data) revealed that of the 80,386 city residents, 1 in every 190 was the victim of a street crime in Fiscal Year 1975. People under 60 years of age were victimized at the rate of 1 in 220. People 60 years old and above experienced a victimization rate of 1 in 124. In other words, persons over 60 years of age had almost twice the victimization rate for street crimes. Of the 421 crimes classified as street crimes, 128 or 30.4 percent were committed against persons 60 or older. These figures are more significant when it is realized that persons 60 years of age and older represented only 19.7 percent of the Wilmington population.²³

Detroit, Mich.

A report prepared by the Detroit Police Department called "Senior Citizens as Victims of Major Crimes" revealed the following data:

SENIOR CITIZENS AS VICTIMS OF CRIME IN COMPARISON WITH THE TOTAL NUMBER OF VICTIMS

| | 1971 | 1972 ¹ | 1973 |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|
| Total robbery not armed..... | 6,766 | 3,802 | 4,895 |
| Senior citizens..... | 2,296 | 1,147 | 1,352 |
| Percent of total..... | 33.9 | 30 | 27.6 |
| Total breaking and entering..... | 30,798 | 20,156 | 21,154 |
| Senior citizens..... | 3,442 | 4,552 | 5,899 |
| Percent of total..... | 11.2 | 22.5 | 27.9 |
| Total robbery armed..... | 12,227 | 7,908 | 9,934 |
| Senior citizens..... | 2,082 | 1,201 | 1,701 |
| Percent of total..... | 17 | 15 | 17.1 |
| Total homicides..... | 690 | 560 | 751 |
| Senior citizens..... | 65 | 51 | 98 |
| Percent of total..... | 9.4 | 10.7 | 13 |
| Total rapes..... | 472 | 359 | 692 |
| Senior citizens..... | 21 | 21 | 35 |
| Percent of total..... | 9.4 | 5.9 | 5.1 |

¹⁹ mo.

In this study, senior citizens were defined as those 55 years of age and older.²⁴ These statistics represent only those crimes reported to the police. Although senior citizens represented 22 percent of the population, they experienced 27.6 percent of the unarmed robberies in 1973. They experienced 27.9 percent of the burglaries (a 5.4 percent increase over the previous year). Other noteworthy figures are the increase in homicides from 1971 to 1973 (3.6 percent) and the decrease in rapes from 1971 to 1973 (4.3 percent).

²² From paper by Floyd Feeney and Adrienne Weir, "The Prevention and Control of Robbery—A Summary," Administration of Criminal Justice, University of California at Davis, February 1974.

²³ See p. 6 of hearing, "Elderly Crime Victimization (Wilmington, Del., Crime Resistance Task Force)," held before the Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests of the House Select Committee on Aging, May 6, 1975.

²⁴ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Crime Prevention Programs)," p. 4.

Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif.

A United States Census Bureau Survey (reported in the February 1976 Police Chief magazine) on the incidence of crime in Los Angeles for people 65 years of age and older revealed:

1. 1 in 56 people over 65 years had suffered a burglary or auto theft,
2. 1 in 73 had been assaulted,
3. 1 in 188 had been a victim of a purse snatching,
4. 1 in 204 had been a victim of robbery, and
5. 1 in 440 had been a victim of attempted robbery.

In that same issue, California State Attorney General Evelle J. Younger reported that the San Francisco and Los Angeles police departments noted that more than 90 percent of bunco and confidence game victims were over 65 years old and were usually women. In California, medical quackery is estimated to be a \$50 million business; senior citizens are the prime targets, as evidenced by the fact that 70 percent of the cases that come to the attention of the criminal justice system involve elderly victims.

Houston, Tex.

A study was undertaken between June 1971 and June 1973 by North Texas State University in the Houston Model Neighborhood Area (HMNA) to determine if people 65 and over were overvictimized relative to their proportion of the population. This study is important because:

1. The area surveyed is located near the center of the city.
2. The area is densely populated by 3 distinct ethnic groups: whites, blacks, and Mexican Americans.
3. The density is 3 times that for Houston.
4. Seventeen percent of the city's elderly live there (10 percent of Houston's population is 65 or older).
5. Over 16 percent of the city's Mexican Americans 65 and above live there and more than 34 percent of the city's blacks 65 and above live there.
6. The HMNA comprises only 3 percent of the Houston land area but has 28.3 percent of the city's families with incomes less than \$3,000.²⁵

This study revealed that the elderly (people 65 and over) experienced 29.8 crimes per 100 people, while those under 65 experienced 41.7 per 100 people of all crimes included in the study. A detailed breakdown follows:

²⁵ Report by Raymond Forston and James Kitchens, North Texas State University, "Criminal Victimization of the Aged: The Houston Model Neighborhood Area," 1974, pp. 3 and 4. The criminal victimization rate is the number of criminally victimized people per specified number of people. Since there is no systematic data gathering on, or tradition of literature about, criminal victimization in the United States, no standard has been agreed upon for the population base to be used in computing victimization rates. In this study a population base of 100 rather than 100,000 is used because it allows one easily to speak in terms of the percentage of people who are criminally victimized.

TABLE V.—VICTIMIZATION BY AGE²⁶

| | Under 65 | 65 and over |
|----------------------|----------|-------------|
| All crimes..... | 41.7 | 29.8 |
| Robbery..... | 4.7 | 5.6 |
| Burglary..... | 13.8 | 7.9 |
| Auto theft..... | 4.7 | 3 |
| Theft..... | 10 | 4.9 |
| Swindling..... | 2.2 | 3.8 |
| Purse snatching..... | 1.3 | 3.2 |
| Assault..... | 3.5 | 1.3 |
| Rape..... | 2.5 | 0 |
| Murder..... | .03 | .08 |

Considering all crimes combined, the elderly are not overly victimized. However, for certain crimes, e.g., robbery, swindling, purse snatching, and homicide, those 65 and over are more highly victimized than the under 65 group.

Texas

A second study was undertaken by North Texas State University to determine criminal victimization over the entire state of Texas. The methodology and sampling of this study, however, are not comparable with the HMNA study. Some of these differences include:

1. Use of questionnaires instead of the previous method of personal interview;
2. Using an availability sample as opposed to a purposive selection (all 3 ethnic groups sampled equally) of a small geographic unit with quota sampling in that unit;
3. No comparison study of persons under 60 years of age; and
4. Change in base for "elderly"—Houston used an age base of 65, while the Texas state study used a base of 60.

Data from the study reveals that of the 3,742 elderly people who completed the questionnaire, 496 reported incidents of victimization in the previous year. This results in a 13.3 (13 per 100) victimization rate in their 9 categories of crime. The crime most often perpetrated against the elderly was burglary, followed closely by theft.

The state victimization rate of 13.3 was compared to the Houston Model Neighborhood Area rate of 29.8. The researchers suggest that the "differences between the two studies probably reflect the lower incidence of all crimes on a statewide basis compared to the central city of Houston * * *"²⁷

Boston, Mass.

A 1972 study in Boston showed that the elderly experienced 28 percent of all robberies even though they comprised only 12 percent of the population.²⁸ John E. Conklin, under the auspices of the Center for Criminal Justice at Harvard Law School conducted a study of robbery in Boston in 1968 which only utilized police reports for the first half of that year. "Elderly" in this study is considered 60 years

²⁶ Ibid., p. 10.

²⁷ Report by Cora A. Martin and Ann S. Reban, North Texas State University, "Criminal Victimization of the Aged in Texas," 1970, p. 24.

²⁸ From article by Thomas Reppetto, "Crime and Housing in a Metropolitan Area: A Study of the Patterns of Residential Crime," *Urban Systems Research and Engineering*, 1972.

old and above. Of the 847 cases reported, 752 or 89 percent recorded the age of the victim and were analyzed for the study. This revealed that 586 or 77.9 percent of the robberies were perpetrated against those under 60 and 166 or 22.1 percent were committed against the elderly.

Column F on the following table clearly shows that robbery rates (which includes street holdups, purse snatchings and residential robberies) rise with increasing age. "Citizens who are 70 years old and over have a victimization rate in these crimes that is more than 50 percent higher than the rate for the total population."

TABLE VI.—RATES OF VICTIMIZATION IN ROBBERIES²⁹

| Age groups (A) | Number in Boston popula- tion, 1970 (B) | Number of robberies, 1968 (C) | 1968 rate of robbery (D) | Number of individual robberies, 1968 (E) | 1968 rate of individual robberies (F) |
|-------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| 0 to 9..... | 101,634 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 to 19..... | 112,122 | 88 | 78.5 | 63 | 56.2 |
| 20 to 29..... | 125,043 | 177 | 141.6 | 99 | 79.2 |
| 30 to 39..... | 60,562 | 93 | 153.6 | 48 | 79.3 |
| 40 to 49..... | 64,433 | 106 | 164.5 | 64 | 99.3 |
| 50-59..... | 64,763 | 122 | 188.4 | 52 | 80.3 |
| 60 to 69..... | 57,646 | 94 | 163.1 | 58 | 100.6 |
| 70 and over..... | 54,568 | 72 | 131.2 | 60 | 109.4 |
| Total..... | 641,071 | 752 | 117.3 | 444 | 69.3 |

Kansas City, Mo.

"Patterns of Crimes Against Older Americans," commonly referred to as the Kansas City Study, is the most extensive, in-depth report to date on criminal victimization of the elderly. In this 3-year study, conducted by Carl L. Cunningham of the Midwest Research Institute, serious crimes against persons 60 and above were probed. Between September 1, 1972, and April 15, 1975, 2,958 criminal acts were committed against the elderly (in the following categories: burglary, robbery, "larceny purse snatching," assault, fraud, rape, and homicide) and of that number, approximately 1,400 were studied in detail. The Kansas City Study uncovered some valuable information. Overall, younger persons have a higher victimization rate than the elderly with one major exception—the rate for robbery. In the non-inner city, elderly persons experience a strong-arm robbery rate of approximately twice that experienced by younger persons living in the same area. Although the difference in rates of strong-arm robbery is similar for both the old (1.70) and the young in the inner city (2.09), the inner-city elderly are victims of strong-arm robbery at a rate approximately four times greater than that for younger persons in the non-inner city. This comparison clearly illustrates the disproportionate victimization of the inner-city elderly for strong-arm robbery as compared to all age groups outside the inner city.

²⁹ From article by John E. Conklin, "Robbery, Elderly, and Fear: An Urban Problem in Search of Solution," in *Crime and the Elderly: Challenge and Response*, edited by Jack Goldsmith and Sharon S. Goldsmith, D.C. Heath, Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass., 1976, p. 100.

TABLE VII.—CRIME RATES FOR PERSONS 60 AND OLDER, AND PERSONS UNDER 60 YEARS OF AGE BY AREA OF CITY³⁰

[Sept. 1, 1972, through Jan. 31, 1974]

| Area and age victim | Crime rate per 1,000 population | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|----------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|---------|-------|------|----------|
| | Total ^a | Burglary | Robbery total | Armed robbery | Strong-arm robbery | Assault | Fraud | Rape | Homicide |
| Inner city: | | | | | | | | | |
| 60 or older..... | 28.06 | 14.82 | 7.11 | 3.42 | 3.69 | 1.49 | 0.75 | 0.09 | 0.11 |
| Younger than 60..... | 60.72 | 28.81 | 11.39 | 7.58 | 3.82 | 15.77 | 2.74 | 1.52 | .48 |
| Noninner city: | | | | | | | | | |
| 60 or older..... | 14.85 | 9.88 | 3.63 | 1.70 | 1.93 | .85 | .46 | .03 | .00 |
| Younger than 60..... | 25.72 | 15.81 | 3.06 | 2.09 | .97 | 4.50 | 1.73 | .51 | .11 |

^a Based reported crimes on per 1,000 population in respective groups. Information for both groups were obtained through the cooperation of the Kansas City, Mo., Police Department's offense records. Inner-city and non-inner-city rates are based on place of occurrence of the crime and not on the residence of the victim.

SUBCOMMITTEE SURVEY

The subcommittee's survey of 50 chiefs of police throughout the country asked the following: "Are the elderly in your area disproportionately victimized? If yes, name the crimes in which the elderly are overly victimized."

Ten cities reported the elderly were disproportionately victimized in certain areas of crime (34 out of 50 responding):

- Atlanta, Ga.: Pedestrian robbery, flimflam.
- Detroit, Mich.: Unarmed robbery, breaking and entering.
- Denver, Colo.: Robbery.
- Hartford, Conn.: Purse snatching, muggings, bunco.
- Montgomery, Ala.: Con games, robbery.
- Montpelier, Vt.: Commercial frauds, medical quackery, insurance fraud, high pressure sales.
- San Antonio, Tex.: Con games, swindles.
- Seattle, Wash.: Purse snatching, crimes against person.
- Newark, N.J.: Generally victimized to a greater degree than the general public, especially if the elderly are residing in public housing in an economically depressed area.
- Philadelphia, Pa.: robbery.

Cities not reporting the elderly being overly victimized were: Athens, Ohio; Augusta, Maine; Baltimore, Md.; Boise, Idaho; Chicago, Ill.; Clarksburg, W. Va.; Des Moines, Iowa; Fayetteville, Ark.; Houston, Tex.; Hutchinson, Kans.; Ithaca, N.Y.; Las Cruces, N. Mex.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Milford, Del.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Minot, N. Dak.; New York, N.Y.; Olympia, Wash.; Omaha, Nebr.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Rapid City, S. Dak.; Richmond, Va.; St. Petersburg, Fla.; and Dover, Del.

"AT RISK" AND UNDERREPORTING PROBLEMS

In attempting to determine the criminal victimization rate for the elderly, the subcommittee frequently encountered the influence of the "at risk"³¹ factor. A number of researchers state that one reason the

³⁰ See "Patterns of Crimes Against Older Americans," p. 6.

³¹ The "at risk" factor refers to the probability of becoming a victim of a crime.

elderly appear undervictimized in comparison to the overall population, is that they have already circumscribed their activities. Large numbers of the elderly (particularly the urban elderly) have restricted their trips in the community to those that are essential. They have virtually eliminated outside travel after sunset, and they avoid specific areas in the community. Therefore, they have reduced their opportunity of becoming victims of crime and are less at risk than other population groups.

Mr. McQuade spoke of this before the subcommittee:

Mr. ROYBAL. * * *

You stated in your testimony that the elderly are victimized less than the general population. Now this comes to me as a surprise. You have stated even as far as household property is concerned that the elderly are less victimized than anyone else.

Other witnesses have testified to the contrary before this subcommittee.

Why do you think that we have this conflicting data?

Mr. McQuade. This information that we have, Mr. Chairman, is that the elderly stay at home more. While they are at home, the opportunity for burglars to gain access without being observed is greatly decreased. They are not able to get into those places.

The other factor is that the fear of being out helps to reduce the crime against the elderly. This fear has the greatest impact. * * *

More than one-half of the older persons surveyed indicated that they had limited or changed their patterns of living in order to minimize their risk of victimization. Add to this the diminished activity and increased infirmity that often accompany aging, and we have a group of people who are rarely in high-risk crime situations. In the usual sense of the word, they may not be victimized, but such fragile safety exacts a high price by restricting their freedom to go about normal activities, as well as affecting their peace of mind.³²

Crime statistics do not reflect the difference in exposure rates. Carl L. Cunningham expounded on this issue:

Although the aging person is somewhat less often criminally victimized, considering the population of a metropolitan area as a whole, that isn't a very informative comparison. The elderly living in or near certain neighborhoods of Kansas City, Missouri, for example, can be as much as 8 times more vulnerable to serious crimes such as robbery, burglary or major larcenies than a younger resident of a relatively safe suburb who works and shops in areas with low crime rates. This disparity is all the more significant considering the fact that most older Americans live generally circumspect and conservative lives. They are usually active avoiders of crime conducive situations. Their special vulnerabilities stem primarily from the fact that economic and social changes have tended to concentrate the elderly population of a metropolitan area where there are relatively high numbers of unemployed male youths who are dropouts from school. Thus, they are in close contact with precisely that element of society most likely to criminally victimize them.³³

As in many areas in the study of crime, there are contradictory statements in regard to the underreporting of victimizations. Dozens of elderly citizens who testified before the subcommittee stated that they did not report their victimization of the police. The reasons often cited were: fear of reprisals; belief that due to a lack of evidence, the police could not locate the offender; and the feeling that the crime was not of sufficient importance to bother the police. In testimony before the subcommittee, Mr. McQuade stated, "There is no question they are often afraid to report because of the consequences that may be attached to it."³⁴ Further, a study of crime and the elderly in Mult-

³² See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Federal Law Enforcement Agencies—LEAA and FBI)," pp. 10, 11, and 5.

³³ See "Patterns of Crimes Against Older Americans," p. 6.

³⁴ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Federal Law Enforcement Agencies—LEAA and FBI)," p. 21.

nomah County revealed that only 47 percent reported incidents to the police.³⁵

The Houston study revealed that less than half (45.5 percent) of the crimes that were reported to the researchers were reported to the police. In an age breakdown, those over 65 years of age showed similar reporting patterns to those under 65 years of age.³⁶ In a written response to the subcommittee on the question of underreporting, LEAA replied:

Data from the National Crime Panel surveys show that the elderly are no more reluctant to report crimes to the police than those in any other age group. In fact, persons age 65 and over are far more likely than those age 12-19 to report personal crimes of violence and theft, and they are as likely to do so as those in the other age groups. For all victims, there emerged a fairly uniform pattern of whether or not victimizations were reported to police authorities.³⁷

It is important to note that the above written statement is in direct contradiction to Mr. McQuade's testimony before the subcommittee.^{37a}

In the opinion of the subcommittee, the most salient comment in regard to underreporting came from Dr. Morton Leeds in his testimony in Washington, D.C. on March 15, 1976:

Mr. ROYBAL. Well, I find that senior citizens that belong to clubs do report, but the vast majority that do not belong to clubs are the ones who do not make a report, and, therefore, we can't really judge what the real crime rate is.

Dr. LEEDS. I think your cue is if a person is poor and lower class reporting will be much lower than middle class reporting. The middle class is wired into the system, and they trust the police, and accept the fact that the police can offer certain forms of redress, and certain forms of assistance.

But for the poor people, you don't get this kind of wiring into the system, and, as far as they are concerned, it's a waste of time to communicate the fact.³⁸

SUMMARY

In summary, while it is difficult to make a clear assessment from the preceding data, certain facts are apparent:

1. The FBI Uniform Crime Report is useless as an index of crime against the elderly because it does not include the age of the victim and utilizes only crimes reported to the police.
2. There are certain methodological factors in the LEAA studies which cause the subcommittee to question their application to the elderly. The use of aggregate figures, by presenting an average, tend to mask important divergencies in subpopulations, e.g., the high victimization rates experienced by elderly, inner city residents. The crime categories utilized include some crimes in which older persons are virtually excluded, and preclude crime categories in which the elderly are particularly vulnerable. The age interval used by LEAA (65 and over), being open-ended, subsumes too large and undifferentiated a population and tends to skew the data. The data do not reflect the "at risk" factor.
3. The raw data and the comparative data clearly indicate a significant crime problem for the elderly.

³⁵ Report by Marlene A. Young Rifai, "Older Americans Crime Prevention Research" Preliminary Report #5, May 12, 1976, p. 9.

³⁶ See "Criminal Victimization of the Aged: The Houston Model Neighborhood Area," p. 18.

³⁷ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Federal Law Enforcement Agencies—LEAA and FBI)," p. 48.

^{37a} *Ibid.*, p. 21.

³⁸ See pp. 24 and 25 of hearing, "Elderly Crime Victimization (Residential Security)," held before the Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests of the House Select Committee on Aging, Mar. 15, 1976.

4. This is supported by numerous studies cited above which generally indicate higher victimization rates for inner city elderly in particular crime categories.

Taken as a whole, the available data indicates that a significant number of the elderly are victimized, that the victimization rate is increasing, and that the older American in the inner city is disproportionately the victim of crime.

A PROFILE OF THE VICTIM AND THE OFFENDER

In light of testimony presented before the subcommittee, it became clear that insight into the problem of elderly victimization would be enhanced by the collection and analyzation of data on the victims of crime, and the criminal offenders.

The study of victimology is a relatively new area of criminology. Most of the previous research was concerned with the offender. Therefore, a review of the major crime studies that provide profiles of the elderly crime victim was undertaken.

VICTIM

Wilmington, Del.

The Wilmington, Del., study of crime against the elderly made an effort to obtain data on the victim. Police incident reports were used to identify the victims of street crime 60 years of age and above in Fiscal Year 1975. Then a victim survey—a brief questionnaire—was mailed to each person. Of the 128 surveys distributed, 105 or 82 percent were returned with usable information. Their data revealed the following information about the victim:³⁹

Age: 86.7 percent of the sample were 60-77.

Race and sex: 72.6 percent of the sample were white females.

Multiple victims: These 105 people were victimized a total of 144 times since they became 60 years of age.

Injuries: 41.4 percent of the sample received injuries.

Environment: 76 percent of the victims were alone, crime normally occurred within four blocks of the victim's residence.

Detroit, Mich.

In the Cass Corridor Safety for Senior Study conducted by the Detroit Police Department, it was found that:⁴⁰

Age: The average age of the victims was 67.8 years, 12 percent of them were over 80 years of age.

Race: Approximately 63 percent were white; 32 percent were black; and 5 percent were other races.

Sex: 20 percent more females than males were victimized.

Environment: 61 percent of senior citizens victimized lived in apartments or multifamily units.

Income: The majority of the victims were poor, 68 percent had incomes of less than \$3,500, many of the remainder had annual incomes below \$7,000.

Houston, Tex.

The Houston Model Neighborhood Area Study recorded the following statistics on the elderly victims of crime:⁴¹

Age: The age breakdown in this study was under 65 or 65 and over (the rate is determined on a per 100 people basis).

³⁹ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Wilmington, Del., Crime Resistance Task Force)," p. 8.
⁴⁰ From article by Wayne W. Bradley, "Cass Corridor Safety for Senior Project," *The Police Chief*, February 1976, p. 43.
⁴¹ See "Criminal Victimization of the Aged: The Houston Model Neighborhood Area," p. 12.

All crimes (considered in the study); 41.7 percent were under 65; and 29.8 percent were over 65.

Race: 30.7 percent were white; 38.8 percent were black; and 15.4 percent were Mexican American.

Included are two tables which provide a more precise breakdown on victimization of the elderly by race and sex.

TABLE VIII.—VICTIMIZATION OF AGED BY RACE ⁴²

| | White aged | Black aged | Mexican-American aged |
|----------------------|------------|------------|-----------------------|
| All crimes..... | 30.7 | 38.8 | 15.4 |
| Robbery..... | 1.7 | 7.1 | 3.5 |
| Burglary..... | 8.5 | 9.0 | 5.6 |
| Auto theft..... | 1.7 | 3.8 | 4.2 |
| Theft..... | 9.7 | 5.2 | 0 |
| Swindling..... | 4.0 | 5.7 | .7 |
| Purse snatching..... | 4.5 | 3.8 | .7 |
| Assault..... | .6 | 2.8 | 0 |
| Rape..... | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Murder..... | 0 | 1.4 | .7 |

TABLE IX.—VICTIMIZATION OF AGED BY SEX ⁴³

| | Aged males | Aged females |
|----------------------|------------|--------------|
| All crimes..... | 26.0 | 32.0 |
| Robbery..... | 5.1 | 3.7 |
| Burglary..... | 8.1 | 8.9 |
| Auto theft..... | 4.3 | 1.3 |
| Theft..... | 5.1 | 4.7 |
| Swindling..... | 2.1 | 5.1 |
| Purse snatching..... | | 5.7 |
| Assault..... | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| Rape..... | | 0 |
| Murder..... | 0 | 1.3 |

Sex: 26 percent were male; and 32 percent were female.

Environment: Approximately half the victims were alone; the majority of crimes were committed in or near the home.

Income: 80 percent had incomes of less than \$5,000; 16 percent had incomes between \$5,000 to \$9,999; and 3 percent had incomes above \$10,000.

One of the most interesting breakdowns in the Houston study is the comparison of the race of the victim with the race of the offender. This establishes (in Houston at least) that generally crime is highly intra-racial. The major exception is purse snatching—a crime which is more often committed by blacks. Crimes against the person are more highly intra-racial than crimes committed against property.

⁴¹ See "Criminal Victimization of the Aged: The Houston Model Neighborhood Area," p. 12.

⁴² Ibid.

TABLE X.—RACES OF OFFENDERS AND THEIR VICTIMS FOR SPECIFIED CRIMES ⁴⁴

| Race of victim and crime | Race of offender | | | | Total |
|--------------------------|------------------|-------|------------------|---------|-------|
| | White | Black | Mexican-American | Unknown | |
| White: | | | | | |
| Robbery..... | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Burglary..... | 3 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 15 |
| Auto theft..... | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| Theft..... | 5 | 1 | 3 | 24 | 33 |
| Swindling..... | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 |
| Assault..... | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Purse snatching..... | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Rape..... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Murder..... | 1/19 | 0/11 | 0/8 | 0/41 | 1/79 |
| Black: | | | | | |
| Robbery..... | 4 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 24 |
| Burglary..... | 0 | 13 | 1 | 27 | 41 |
| Auto theft..... | 0 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 17 |
| Theft..... | 0 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 17 |
| Swindling..... | 5 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 14 |
| Assault..... | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| Purse snatching..... | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| Rape..... | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Murder..... | 0/12 | 0/67 | 0/3 | 3/59 | 3/141 |
| Mexican-American: | | | | | |
| Robbery..... | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Burglary..... | 0 | 2 | 6 | 11 | 19 |
| Auto theft..... | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| Theft..... | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 |
| Swindling..... | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Assault..... | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Purse snatching..... | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Rape..... | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Murder..... | 1/8 | 0/11 | 1/13 | 0/29 | 2/61 |

Kansas City, Mo.

The Kansas City study conducted interviews with victims, next of kin, police, witnesses, and even volunteer ex-felons in an attempt to develop precise data on elderly victims of crime. The data reveal the following information: ⁴⁵

Age: The median age of the victim was 68.8 for blacks, however, the median age was 66.3. More than 12 percent of the victims were over 80 years of age.

Race: Although blacks represent 14.9 percent of the elderly population, they experience 21.7 percent of the victimizations. Their rate of victimization was almost 20 percent higher than for whites.

Sex: 45.6 percent were male; and 54.4 percent were female.

Some of the interesting breakdowns in these data are:

1. Although women were the larger proportion of victims, males had a higher incidence rate of crime—9 per 1,000 greater than women. (This may be explained by the following facts: 1) when a couple is burglarized, it is cited statistically as a male incident, and 2) men are more often on the streets and have a higher "at risk" factor.)

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 20.

⁴⁵ See "Patterns of Crimes Against Older Americans," pp. 46-58.

2. Elderly black males were victimized at a rate of 75.4 percent higher than white males.
3. The black female victimization rate was 39.0 percent higher than the white female victimization rate.

Multiple victims: Of approximately 1,400 victims interviewed, 382 or 27.3 percent reported that they had been victimized during the previous 2 years. Blacks were slightly more likely to be multiple victims at a rate of one in three as opposed to whites who were multiple victims at a rate of one in four. The overwhelming majority of people who were multiple victims were victims of the same type of crime, e.g., victims of robbery tended to be robbed again rather than be assaulted.

The following table illustrates the breakdown of victimization of the elderly by sex and race.

TABLE XI.—TYPE OF VICTIMIZATION BY SEX BY RACE OF ELDERLY VICTIMS SEPT. 1, 1972-APR. 15, 1975.^{1,40}

| Type of crime | All elderly victims | | | | | | Black | | | | | | White | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------|----------------|--------|---------|----------------|---------|---------|----------------|--------|---------|----------------|---------|---------|----------------|--------|---------|----------------|
| | Females | | | Males | | | Females | | | Males | | | Females | | | Males | | |
| | Number | Percent | Rate Per 1,000 | Number | Percent | Rate Per 1,000 | Number | Percent | Rate Per 1,000 | Number | Percent | Rate Per 1,000 | Number | Percent | Rate Per 1,000 | Number | Percent | Rate Per 1,000 |
| Burglary | 1,744 | 59.0 | 21.23 | 194 | 66.9 | 28.61 | 231 | 66.0 | 42.57 | 668 | 50.7 | 15.61 | 651 | 65.2 | 23.99 | | | |
| Robbery: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Armed | 318 | 10.8 | 3.87 | 12 | 4.1 | 1.77 | 46 | 13.1 | 8.48 | 95 | 7.2 | 2.22 | 165 | 16.5 | 6.08 | | | |
| Strong-arm: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-purse snatch | 183 | 6.2 | 2.23 | 14 | 4.8 | 2.06 | 25 | 7.1 | 4.61 | 45 | 3.4 | 1.05 | 99 | 9.9 | 3.65 | | | |
| Purse snatch | 208 | 7.0 | 2.53 | 18 | 6.2 | 2.65 | | | | 190 | 14.4 | 4.44 | | | | | | |
| Strong-arm total | 391 | 13.2 | 4.76 | 32 | 11.0 | 4.71 | 25 | 7.1 | 4.61 | 235 | 17.8 | 5.49 | 99 | 9.9 | 3.65 | | | |
| Robbery total | 709 | 24.0 | 8.63 | 44 | 15.1 | 6.48 | 71 | 20.2 | 13.09 | 330 | 25.0 | 7.71 | 264 | 26.4 | 9.73 | | | |
| Larceny Purse snatch | 272 | 9.2 | 3.21 | 31 | 10.7 | 4.37 | 38 | 10.9 | 7.00 | 211 | 16.3 | 5.63 | 66 | 6.6 | 2.43 | | | |
| Assault | 145 | 4.9 | 1.77 | 10 | 3.4 | 1.86 | 2 | .6 | 1.37 | 31 | 2.4 | .72 | 15 | 1.5 | .55 | | | |
| Fraud | 67 | 2.3 | .82 | 6 | 2.1 | .88 | 2 | .6 | .37 | 36 | 2.9 | .89 | 2 | .2 | .07 | | | |
| Homicide | 8 | .3 | .10 | 3 | 1.0 | .44 | | | | 7 | .5 | .16 | | | | | | |
| Rape | 10 | .3 | .12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All crimes | 2,955 | 100.0 | 35.98 | 290 | 99.9 | 42.77 | 350 | 100.0 | 64.50 | 1,317 | 100.0 | 30.77 | 998 | 99.9 | 36.78 | | | |

¹ Crime categories containing fewer than 30 observations should be interpreted with caution.

⁴⁰ See "Patterns of Crimes Against Older Americans," p. 55.

The Kansas City study provides further data:

| | Total | |
|---|-------|---------|
| | N | Percent |
| Injuries: 14.6 percent received moderate to severe injuries | | |
| Injury to victim: | | |
| None----- | 358 | 69.6 |
| Minor (no treatment)----- | 81 | 15.8 |
| Moderate (treatment required)----- | 53 | 10.3 |
| Severe (hospitalization)----- | 22 | 4.3 |
| Total----- | 514 | 100.0 |

Environment: Differed slightly for each crime. Robbery occurred at the place of employment and at or near the home. Purse snatching occurred near the home and areas outside of the neighborhood. Blacks were more likely to be robbed in their homes.

Income: Elderly victims of crime were generally poor. The median annual income was less than \$3,000. The median income for white victims was 67.7 percent higher for black victims. The highest median income was for white males—\$5,382.38. The lowest was black females at \$1,692.83. (The study suggests that although economics is the motivation for most crime, it is clearly not the only factor—the opportunity to victimize and the vulnerability of the victim seem to be more important.)

Boston, Mass.

A study of robbery and the elderly in Boston showed that elderly victims were more often alone than non-elderly victims. Although the victim rarely puts up any type of resistance, the offender is more apt to use force on the elderly. The older victim was also more often and more seriously hurt.⁴⁷

Injury: 25.2 percent of the victims under 60 were injured; 19.7 percent required hospital treatment; 41.9 percent of the victims over 60 were injured; and 27.5 percent required hospital treatment.

This study also examined the relationship between the elderly victim and the offender. This will be discussed in the section on the criminal offender.

CONDITIONS INCREASING THE ELDERLY'S VULNERABILITY

The data from these reports, however, do not fully discuss some conditions inherent in the aging process that increase the elderly's vulnerability to criminal victimization. The following are factors which the subcommittee feels are vitally important in understanding the relationship of crime to the elderly person.

Economic factors

Almost half of the population 65 and over are retired, and live on a fixed income at or below the poverty level. In 1973, the poverty threshold for a couple was set at \$2505 and at \$1974 for an individual. In all older families, 12 percent were below the poverty level; for the older person living alone or with nonrelatives, 37 percent were below the poverty level. The Bureau of Labor Statistics indicated that it costs a retired couple a minimum of \$5414 a year to maintain an "intermediate" standard of living in an American city. Half the aged couples could not afford this "modest but adequate" standard of living.

Elderly crime victims are poor both relatively and absolutely. The theft of \$20.00 from an elderly person on a fixed income can represent a much greater relative loss than the same amount stolen from an

⁴⁷ See "Robbery, Elderly, and Fear: An Urban Problem in Search of Solution," p. 104.

employed person. Many older people have no bank accounts from which they can withdraw funds in an emergency, e.g., if robbed. They must often wait until their social security, pension, or supplemental security income checks arrive in the following month.

This protracted loss also occurs when an older person's property is stolen or damaged. The elderly generally do not have the financial capability to replace or repair the property. The dollar loss or theft of a television set may not appear significant in terms of the FBI Crime index—but the consequences of the loss for the elderly person may be dramatic. The losses experienced by the elderly victim can have implications that are far more dramatic than a purely economic evaluation would reveal.

Physical factors

There are some normal conditions in the aging process which cause the older person to be more vulnerable to criminal abuse. Diminished physical strength and stamina are experienced by all older people. With advanced age there is also a greater possibility of incurring physical ailments such as visual or hearing losses, arthritis and circulatory illnesses. Another condition of advanced age is osteoporosis which causes bones to be more brittle, more easily broken, and less quick to heal.

Criminals, particularly teenagers, are aware of the diminished strength and physical weaknesses in the aging population and often seek this more vulnerable group as targets. If the older person is physically harmed as the result of crime, it is difficult to assess the full extent of the injury.

A leg or hip that is broken in a fall during a mugging or purse snatching can mean immobility and dependency for a prolonged period. It can result in being permanently confined to a wheelchair or even an institution.⁴⁸

Environmental factors

One of the key factors in the elderly's vulnerability to crime stems from their location in urban areas, and particularly, their residence in neighborhoods with high crime rates. More than 60 percent of the elderly live in metropolitan areas, and most of these reside in the central city. Many have been living in an area for decades and either for cultural, emotional, or economic reasons have not moved. Many older people live in the central city because they cannot afford housing in the surrounding areas or suburbs. They are often people who are dependent on public transportation. For whatever reason, the urban elderly often find themselves in close proximity to the people most likely to victimize them—the unemployed and teenage dropouts. The dates that the elderly receive social security, SSI, and pension checks are well known in these areas. Criminals know the most likely days that the elderly will have larger sums of cash on their person and in their homes. Older people are also more likely to be victimized repeatedly—frequently the same crime by the same offender.⁴⁹ Because older persons are often unable to move from the area, they do not report the assailant for fear of reprisals.

⁴⁸ From article by Jack Goldsmith, "Community Crime Prevention and the Elderly: A Segmental Approach," *Crime Prevention Review*, California State Attorney General's Office, July 1975, p. 19.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 1 and 2.

Social factors

There are some social conditions, more prevalent in the aging population, which increase their chances of victimization. Statistically, elderly people are more likely to live alone. The criminal is more apt to select a home for burglary that is inhabited by only one elderly person. Older persons are frequently alone on the streets and on public transportation. This again makes them easier targets.

There is indication that older people are particularly susceptible to fraud, bunco, and confidence games. This may be related to the social isolation experienced by many older Americans.

Psychological factors—fear of crime

Fear of crime among the elderly is as debilitating as victimization. Charles R. Work, Deputy Administrator of LEAA, told the Senate Special Committee on Aging, "Fear of crime keeps many of the elderly in our cities virtually prisoners in their homes and apartments." The quality of life for thousands of senior citizens is diminished as they curtail their movement and activities. The issue of fear is so complex that an entire chapter is devoted to it.

OFFENDER

Boston, Mass.

The Boston study found that elderly victims of crime are more frequently held up by young robbers (age 10–19) than are victims 60 years of age or younger. The elderly are also more often held up by blacks than are younger victims. There is also a tendency for the elderly to be robbed by more than one offender. Conklin suggests that these variables are linked in the "opportunistic pattern of robbery" which involves "unplanned attacks on accessible and vulnerable citizens * * *"⁵⁰

The accompanying table provides more information on the characteristics of the robbers and the elderly victims.

TABLE XII.—CHARACTERISTICS OF ROBBERIES INVOLVING THE ELDERLY AND OTHER VICTIMS⁵¹

| Characteristic of robbery | Under 60 | 60 and over | Level of significance |
|---|----------|-------------|-----------------------|
| A. Estimated age of offender: | | | |
| 10-19..... | 31.0% | 42.3% | |
| 20-29..... | 53.5% | 48.0% | |
| 30 and over..... | 15.5% | 9.8% | $\chi^2=6.37$ |
| Total number..... | 419 | 123 | $p<.05$. |
| B. Estimated age status of offender: | | | |
| Juvenile (under 17)..... | 11.2% | 23.6% | |
| Adult (17 and over)..... | 88.8% | 76.4% | $\chi^2=12.18$ |
| Total number..... | 419 | 123 | $p<.001$. |
| C. Race of offender: | | | |
| White..... | 35.6% | 16.3% | |
| Black..... | 64.4% | 83.8% | $\chi^2=35.92$ |
| Total number..... | 533 | 160 | $p<.001$. |
| D. Number of offenders: | | | |
| One..... | 37.9% | 34.3% | |
| Two or more..... | 62.1% | 65.6% | $\chi^2=0.83$ |
| Total number..... | 585 | 166 | Not significant. |
| E. Number of victims: | | | |
| One..... | 89.3% | 94.6% | |
| Two or more..... | 10.7% | 5.4% | $\chi^2=4.35$ |
| Total number..... | 587 | 167 | $p<.05$. |
| F. Type of robbery: | | | |
| Street..... | 42.0% | 30.5% | |
| Purse snatch..... | 9.8% | 25.0% | |
| Home..... | 7.2% | 16.5% | |
| Taxicab..... | 17.9% | 12.2% | |
| Commercial..... | 23.1% | 15.9% | $\chi^2=43.56$ |
| Total number..... | 553 | 164 | $p<.001$. |

⁵⁰ See "Robbery, Elderly, and Fear: An Urban Problem in Search of Solution," p. 101.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

Wilmington, Del.

In the Wilmington, Delaware, study, statistics were kept on the offenders:⁵²

Age: 13–21 years of age in 85 percent of the 174 arrest-related samples.

Sex and race: Black males 92 percent of the 203 perpetrators in the descriptive samples.

Environment: The offender often lives within 10 blocks of the victim.

Interviews were also held with the juvenile offenders in an attempt to gain insight into why they became involved in these street crimes. Some of the more important information gathered:

1. More experienced purse snatchers plan the theft, learning the victim's routines.
2. They are able to determine who has money by the way a woman dresses and the manner in which she holds her purse.
3. Black offenders select white women as victims because they are less likely to be able to identify them and are more likely to have money.
4. Also, black offenders associate black women with their mothers and feel they need their money more than white women.

Detroit, Mich.

Statistics were kept on the suspects arrested for street crimes in the Detroit Cass Corridor study:⁵³

Age: 66 percent ranged in age from 13 to 18 and the remainder were in the 19–25 age group.

Race: 82 percent were black.

Sex: Approximately 98 percent were male.

Houston, Tex.

The Houston Model Neighborhood Area Study also collected data on the offender. Their age breakdown, however, was limited to offenders under 45 and 45 and older.⁵⁴

Age: 92 percent were under 45.

Race: (not rates but cases) 51 were black; 24 were white; and 15 were Mexican American.

Sex: Over 93 percent were male.

Kansas City, Mo.

The Kansas City report states that, "The most salient fact in this study is perhaps the one that the young American is attacking, stealing from, and generally victimizing the old." Their data on the offender were:⁵⁵

Age: 59.7 percent were teenagers; 29.5 percent were in their twenties; 6.7 percent were in their thirties; 2.8 percent were middle age; and 1.3 percent were older persons.

Race: Suspects: 84.2 percent were black/other; and 15.8 percent were white.

⁵² See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Wilmington, Del., Crime Resistance Task Force)," pp. 4 and 5.

⁵³ See "Cass Corridor Safety for Seniors Project," p. 43.

⁵⁴ See "Criminal Victimization of the Aged: The Houston Model Neighborhood Area," p. 24.

⁵⁵ See "Patterns of Crimes Against Older Americans," p. 20.

Sex: 94.3 percent were male; and 5.7 percent were female.

The consolidation of all the data shows that 59.7 percent of the offenders were teenagers and 29.5 percent were in their twenties. Therefore, nearly 90 percent of the offenders were under 30 years of age.

For almost every crime category, the majority of offenders were black (84.2 percent). (Historically police departments have often patrolled minority areas more heavily resulting in higher arrest records for blacks.) White offenders, however, constituted 59.5 percent of all fraud cases. The majority of offenders in all categories of crime, other than fraud, were males. There are also some interesting correlations between the age of the offender and the type of crime committed. For example, burglaries are the most frequent crimes committed by teenagers. Offenders in their twenties and thirties most often commit armed robbery.

Statistics gathered in this study also support the theory that crime is more frequently intra-racial than inter-racial. This reflects the housing patterns of the city. Offenders, especially the young, generally commit crimes in or near their own neighborhoods. Therefore, older white people who live in predominantly white areas are victimized by whites, and blacks who live in predominantly black areas are victimized by blacks. The elderly white people who live in the inner city are generally clustered together in larger integrated areas and thus are subject to being victimized by offenders of both races.³⁶

³⁶ Ibid.

TABLE XIII.—RATES OF VICTIMIZATION BY RACE OF OFFENDER AND VICTIM BY TYPES OF CRIME^a
[All Cases—September 1, 1972, through April 15, 1973]

| Race of victim by type of crime | Total | | White | | Black | | Rate/1,000 black | χ ² | P | Phi | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|------------------|------------------|----------------|------|--------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Rate/1,000 total | Percent | | Rate/1,000 white | | | | | Number | Percent |
| | | | | Number | Percent | | | | | | | |
| Burglary: | 208 | 71.7 | 2.98 | 95.9 | 93 | 1.23 | 115 | 59.6 | | | | |
| White | 82 | 28.3 | 6.72 | 4.1 | 4 | .33 | 78 | 40.4 | 1.65 | | | |
| Black | | | | | | | | | 6.39 | | | |
| Total | 290 | 100.0 | 3.54 | 100.0 | 97 | 1.18 | 193 | 100.0 | 2.35 | 40.152 | | |
| Armed robbery: | 255 | 81.5 | 2.65 | 90.9 | 40 | .57 | 215 | 79.9 | 3.08 | 0 | | |
| White | 58 | 18.5 | 4.75 | 3.1 | 4 | .33 | 54 | 20.1 | 4.42 | | | |
| Black | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 313 | 100.0 | 3.82 | 100.0 | 44 | .54 | 269 | 100.0 | 3.28 | 2.338 | | |
| Strong-arm robbery: | | | | | | | | | | .125 | | |
| (Non-use snatch): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 133 | 78.7 | 1.91 | 100.0 | 20 | .29 | 113 | 75.8 | 1.62 | | | |
| Black | 36 | 21.3 | 2.95 | 0 | 0 | .00 | 36 | 24.2 | 2.95 | | | |
| Total | 169 | 100.0 | 2.06 | 100.0 | 20 | .24 | 149 | 100.0 | 1.82 | 4.783 | | |
| Purse Snatch: | | | | | | | | | | .029 | | |
| White | 184 | 91.1 | 2.64 | 100.0 | 24 | .34 | 160 | 89.9 | 2.29 | | | |
| Black | 18 | 8.9 | 1.47 | 0 | 0 | .00 | 18 | 10.1 | 1.47 | | | |
| Total | 202 | 100.0 | 2.46 | 100.0 | 24 | .29 | 178 | 100.0 | 2.17 | 1.564 | | |
| Strong-arm total: | | | | | | | | | | .211 | | |
| White | 317 | 85.4 | 4.54 | 100.0 | 44 | .63 | 273 | 83.5 | 3.91 | | | |
| Black | 54 | 14.6 | 4.42 | 0 | 0 | .00 | 54 | 16.5 | 4.42 | | | |
| Total | 371 | 100.0 | 4.52 | 100.0 | 44 | .54 | 327 | 100.0 | 3.99 | | | |
| Robbery total: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 572 | 83.6 | 8.20 | 95.5 | 84 | 1.20 | 488 | 81.9 | 6.99 | | | |
| Black | 112 | 16.4 | 9.18 | 4.5 | 4 | .33 | 108 | 18.1 | 8.85 | | | |
| Total | 684 | 100.0 | 8.34 | 100.0 | 88 | 1.07 | 596 | 100.0 | 7.27 | | | |
| Larceny/purse snatch: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 227 | 88.7 | 3.25 | 93.5 | 29 | .42 | 198 | 88.0 | 2.84 | | | |
| Black | 29 | 11.3 | 2.38 | 6.5 | 2 | .16 | 27 | 12.0 | 2.21 | | | |
| Total | 256 | 100.0 | 3.12 | 100.0 | 31 | .38 | 225 | 100.0 | 2.74 | .374 | | |
| Assault: | | | | | | | | | | .541 | | |
| White | 87 | 65.4 | 1.25 | 95.0 | 57 | .82 | 30 | 41.1 | .43 | | | |
| Black | 46 | 34.6 | 3.77 | 5.0 | 3 | .25 | 43 | 58.9 | 3.52 | | | |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 1.62 | 100.0 | 60 | .73 | 73 | 100.0 | .89 | 39.946 | | |

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE XIII.—RATES OF VICTIMIZATION BY RACE OF OFFENDER AND VICTIM BY TYPES OF CRIME ⁵⁷—Continued
 [All Cases—September 1, 1972, through April 15, 1975]

| Race of victim by type of crime | Total | | White | | Black | | Rate/1,000 black | Percent | X ² | P | Phi |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|------------------|---------|----------------|---|------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | | | | | |
| Fraud: | 44 | 80.0 | 39 | 95.1 | 5 | 35.7 | .07 | | | | |
| Black: | 11 | 25.0 | 2 | 4.9 | 9 | 64.3 | .74 | | | | |
| Total: | 55 | 100.0 | 41 | 100.0 | 14 | 100.0 | .17 | | 19.457 | 0 | .647 |
| Total crimes: | 1,138 | 80.3 | 302 | 95.3 | 836 | 75.9 | 12.0 | | | | |
| White: | 280 | 19.7 | 15 | 4.7 | 265 | 24.1 | 21.7 | | | | |
| Black: | 1,418 | 100.0 | 317 | 100.0 | 1,101 | 100.0 | 13.4 | | | | |

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 95.

Subcommittee findings

In a hearing held before the subcommittee on March 29, 1976, George Sunderland, Coordinator, Crime Prevention Program, NRTA/AARP, described the "average" offender:

Only a few years ago, burglars were mostly professional. Today we find most burglars are teenage opportunists. The significance in their being opportunists will be brought out in my remarks addressed to the reduction of this crime.

A study conducted in California drew a profile of the *California* burglar during 1972. We find in our NRTA-AARP studies that this same profile holds true for most burglars in the United States. The burglar today is the following: Characteristics of a burglar: an opportunist; an amateur; a youngster; a male; working with another person or persons in most cases; working within a few miles of his residence—usually within 2 or 3 miles; not skilled in the work of burglary; many pride themselves on entering a residence in 30 seconds and leaving within 3 minutes; trying to appear nonchalant, as though he belongs in the neighborhood; not seeking a confrontation; not violent unless confronted or impeded in escaping—he seldom carries a gun or knife; and seldom a first offender.

According to the California study, more than 90 percent of the apprehended burglars during 1972 were under the age of 30 years; more than 62 percent of the apprehended were teenagers.

Over the past 15 years, we have witnessed a change in the profile of the burglar from predominantly adult to predominantly juvenile; from predominantly a professional who looks upon burglary as his life's work to an amateur who looks for opportunities to commit his crime.⁵⁸

Responses to the subcommittee's survey question, "Do you have any data on the perpetrators of crime against the elderly? If so, will you provide us with your data, e.g. age, sex, race and prior arrests," revealed the following information (only five responded to this question):

Baltimore, Maryland: According to elderly victim description, 43 percent of those crimes in the FBI Crime Index are committed by juveniles (under 18 years). Eighty-three percent are committed by persons 24 years and under.

Ithaca, N. Y.: Most perpetrators were young males, 15-17 years of age.

Montpelier, Vt.:

1. Purse Snatcher—white male juveniles 12-16 years old.
2. Fraud Con-Men—white males 30-38 years old.
3. Commercial Fraud Men—white males 25-30 years old.
4. Medical Quacks—white females 25-40 years old.

(The contributing agency's jurisdiction does not include minority groups.)

New York, N. Y.: According to personnel from the Senior Citizens Robbery Unit, their data revealed that offenders tended to be male youths (14-19) and the incidents occurred mainly (cluster) in communities undergoing socio-economic change rather than in low income or high income areas.

Portland, Oreg.: The only specific analysis made was for purse snatching. Perpetrators were black, 16-17, male and most had prior arrests.

Although it is clear that there is no "average" victim or offender, there is a need for developing a model for each one. If attempts to effect changes are to be made, either through protection or prevention programs, it is vital that resources be directed to the appropriate targets. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice stated that, " * * * one of the most neglected subjects in the study of crime is its victims."⁵⁹ It is hoped that the following profiles will begin to fill the void in this crucial area.

The elderly victim of crime is approximately 68 years of age, and usually female. There is controversy over which racial group is more victimized; data in the studies indicate that blacks are victimized at

⁵⁸ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Crime Prevention Programs)," p. 14.

⁵⁹ Report by President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, p. 38.

a higher rate than their proportion in the population. Studies on victimization and underreporting show that the highest rate of elderly criminal victimization occurs in the inner city. Large numbers of poor blacks live in the city core, and are the least likely to report crimes.

Some studies have indicated that blacks are not victimized disproportionately to their percentage of the population, however, these statistics are being challenged by the National Center on Black Aged (NCBA). Dr. Booker T. Yelder, Jr., Director, Crime Prevention Project at NCBA, testified before the subcommittee in Washington on March 29, 1976:

First. Despite the widespread belief that all black aged are the beneficiaries of some enormous extended family structure, most black aged live alone. There is no one to see to their safety or tend to their needs. If they require help, they must in all too many cases provide it themselves. If they are the victims of crimes in their homes or when they leave home, there is little protection provided them either by the institutions of law enforcement or the community at large.

Second. Most black aged live in poverty. This burden is not made any easier to blacks because they have spent much of their earlier lives in poverty as well. Older persons with limited resources tend to use cash to purchase the necessities of life simply because credit is unavailable. This process causes many black aged to have cash available in their domains during the first of each month. Thus black aged, even though they have far less money than almost any other aged group in America, are far more likely to be mugged, robbed, or burglarized.

Third. Most black aged must live in either decaying urban areas where crime is more prevalent or live in isolated developments where crime is also an "accepted" everyday occurrence.

The results of these living conditions are borne out across the nation and this very definitely includes our nation's Capital. Because of past insensitivity on the part of law enforcement institutions to the problems of the elderly, some victimization statistics indicate that the aged are less often the victims of muggings, thefts, robberies, or break-ins. As social scientists and more importantly as learned black people, we do not believe that these findings accurately reflect the actual experience of most black aged. New research findings prove that the aged, especially the low-income black aged, are victimized at a greater rate than their white aged counterparts.

To black aged persons, the first of the month—the date when social security, supplemental security income, or retirement pension checks arrive—is considered "Rip-Off Day." The black aged are subjected to physical assaults, robberies, and muggings on the streets of cities; and burglaries, rapes, and physical assaults in their domains.

There is little to discourage these sorts of crimes; namely, because the "opportunity" for crime is all too great. The aged, especially the black aged, are easy prey.

The predator of these crimes has only to walk through the hallways of senior citizens housing complexes or wait near food stores or banks and/or around the churches and behold the prey. The defenseless black aged are involved. One may visualize this process as the wolf coming upon a herd of sheep—he has only to decide which one to attack; there will be no fight.

Many black older persons are intimidated or reluctant to call or seek help from the police after being victimized. This is due to the black citizens/police relationships which have been adverse, to say the least, upon black citizens.

Because of poor eyesight, the black aged cannot easily identify their attackers. What is more important to understand is that if the black aged could identify their attackers, they would not, simply because of fear and reprisals. The black aged do not understand the criminal justice system and the idea of going to court can only reinforce negative thoughts of the past.⁶⁰

There is less data on the victimization problems of the Spanish-speaking elderly. Significant testimony was presented before the subcommittee at a hearing in Los Angeles on September 18, 1976.

⁶⁰ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Crime Prevention Programs)," p. 2.

The Hispanic elderly have become fearful of being victims to the point of virtually becoming prisoners in their own homes. Isolation, caused by external forces such as widowhood, the death of friends, poverty, and physical and mental handicaps, is difficult enough for them. But added to these are the fear of crime which forces them to remain in their homes throughout the day and night. No matter how many precautions are taken to protect themselves in the home, still a significant percentage of the elderly crimes occur within the home.

Why are the Hispanic elderly such likely victims of crime? The most widely accepted answer is that vandalism is more common in low-income areas. The Hispanic elderly live in constant fear of danger from gangs, burglars, and professional swindlers who prey on their gullibility.

After the crime has been committed, the Hispanic elderly suffer great psychological consequences because of their inability to deal with the situation effectively due to their distinct cultural and language differences. In many cases the psychological consequences may require a longer recovery period than the actual physical injury. For the Hispanic elderly, things are very often never the same after a crime. There is increased cynicism and distrust of the law which is supposed to protect them, and greater reluctance to take action against criminals who commit the crimes against them.⁶¹

The average income of the victim is approximately \$3250. The person is generally alone when victimized and within ten blocks of place of residence. The victim also stands a 37.9 percent chance of being injured.

A profile of the offender in street and household crimes depicts a man under 30 years of age but most likely a teenager (between the ages of 13 and 18) and generally black. The offenders in confidence games and bunco are generally older, both male and female and usually white.

This report clearly documents the fact that the elderly are being victimized by the youth of America. Even though youngsters ages 10 to 17 make up only 16 percent of the population they account for 45 percent of all persons arrested for serious crimes. Over 60 percent of all criminal arrests are of persons 22 years old or younger. Pinpointing the causes of this aberrant behavior, however, is far more difficult than reporting its existence. Social scientists, government officials, and members of the criminal justice system have all probed for answers; however, no consensus of opinion has been reached.

Research conducted by the subcommittee and testimony presented at its hearing brought one factor to the forefront—that economic incentives seemed to be the motivation for many of these juvenile crimes.

Senator Birch Bayh, chairman of Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency elaborated on this point:

We can trace at least part of this unequal distribution of crime to the idleness of so many of our young people. The rate of unemployment among teen-agers is at a record high and among minority teenagers it is an incredible 50 percent. Teen-agers are at the bottom of the bottom rung of the employment ladder; in hard times they are the most expendable.

We are living in a period in which street crime has become a surrogate for employment and vandalism a release from boredom. This is not a city problem or a regional problem. Teenage crime in rural areas has reached scandalous levels. It takes an unusual boy or girl to resist the temptations of getting into trouble when there is no constructive alternative.

An article entitled "Unemployed Young Blacks Growing Problem in Nation," by Charlayne Hunter, was reprinted in the Congressional Record on July 27, 1976, and provides some of the recent history of the young black unemployment issue:

⁶¹ See "Elderly Crime Victims (Personal Accounts of Fears and Attacks)," p. 37.

Despite chronic unemployment among young blacks that now officially exceeds 40 percent—some estimates range upward of 70 percent—there has been no agreement among experts about how to avert what could become a human disaster in which millions of blacks become adults with no hope of ever finding jobs with a future.

In 1955 the jobless rate for black teenagers was 15.8 percent, compared with 10.3 for whites of the same age, in 1965, it was 26.2 percent compared with 13.4 for whites and in 1973 it was 30.2 percent for blacks, compared with 12.6 for white youths.

The most recent statistics are equally dismal. As of June 1976, that rate, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was 40.3 percent for blacks, compared with 16.1 percent for whites of the same age.

For blacks that rate has increased since last month, when the rate was 33.5 percent. For whites, it has decreased from last month when it was 16.3.

The economic issue becomes ever more relevant when one considers the social disorganization and emotional stress experienced in a family when one or both parents become unemployed. The unemployment rate for all blacks nationally is 12.7 percent, almost double the rate of the white unemployment which is currently 6.6 percent.

An important study was conducted by Charles V. Willie on the relationship of race, socio-economic status, and family status to juvenile delinquency. When both conditions, poverty and non-traditional family composition, exist (this includes any family composition other than the child residing with natural parents), a child is in the highest risk category of becoming delinquent. When only one of these conditions prevails, poverty or non-traditional family composition, the correlation with race becomes the important factor. Being poor increases the risk of a black child becoming delinquent more so than living in a non-traditional family.

For the white child the more salient risk factor that correlates with delinquency is living in a non-traditional family.

The subcommittee realizes that there are limited federal solutions to the multidimensional problem of juvenile delinquency, but meaningful roles can be played by Federal, State and local government. The Federal Government can have an effect on employment. Further consideration must be given to employment bills that have specific provisions for education, training and jobs for youth.

Research needs to be undertaken on juveniles involved in violent crimes with an emphasis on determining why many of these crimes are perpetrated on the elderly.

The relationship between learning disabilities, school dropouts and delinquency also requires exploration.

Local governments and school districts must continue to make school and training more relevant to jobs in the community. School districts that are still expelling truants could implement a new policy of retaining these students on the school premises. Private enterprise can expand their present role in providing education, training and employment to those who have been educationally disadvantaged.

The subcommittee feels that further investigation of the victim, the offender, and the criminal victimization rate are needed. These studies should take into account the "at risk" factor and underreporting of the inner city victim. Until that is done, LEAA's thesis that the overall victimization rate for the elderly is low must be accepted although not unequivocally. The LEAA position, however, does not preclude the possibility that there are certain subgroups in the elderly population that experience high victimization rates. The independent

studies in chapter I establish that the urban, inner city elderly suffer high rates of victimization. A paper by George Gerharz suggests why LEAA data does not reflect this: "The generality of the sample and data presented does not allow for the exploration of differences which occur within particular geographic areas of cities."⁶² Chapter II of this report demonstrates that some subgroups, particularly women and blacks, experience high victimization rates.

⁶² George Gerharz, Concept paper: "Extent and Consequences of Victimization of the Older Adult Population," November 1976, p. 2.

TABLE XIV.—PROBLEMS: COMPARISON OF CHICAGO SURVEY GROUPS WITH NATIONAL SAMPLE (HARRIS POLL)⁶²

[In percent]

| | 65 yr and over | |
|---|--|----------|
| | Total of Chicago survey (groups N=516) | National |
| Fear of crime..... | 41 | 23 |
| Poor health..... | 37 | 21 |
| Not having enough money to live on..... | 22 | 15 |
| Loneliness..... | 10 | 12 |
| Not enough medical care..... | 10 | 10 |
| Not enough education..... | 4 | 8 |
| Not feeling needed..... | 4 | 7 |
| Not enough to do to keep busy..... | 4 | 6 |
| Not enough friends..... | 4 | 5 |
| Not enough job opportunities..... | 3 | 5 |
| Poor housing..... | 7 | 4 |
| Not enough clothing..... | 3 | 3 |
| Not seeing children or grandchildren or other relatives enough ¹ | 8 | ----- |
| Not being able to get places—good transportation not available ² | 9 | ----- |

¹ Not used in Harris Poll.

Dozens of witnesses appeared before the subcommittee and related their victimization experiences. Two statements have been selected that are representative of what was heard in various parts of the country. The first, "Mr. K," spoke before the subcommittee in Washington, D. C., on June 3, 1976:

Mr. K. I am coming before you to say my little bit in behalf of the senior citizens in that area. The problems we are having there are vandalism, nonsecurity and when I say vandalism, you name it, that is what we have had around there. The old, the new, it is demolished and so on and so forth. Now, I have not been attacked myself, I am not bragging about it but my wife has been attacked. And speaking about going to church or anywhere at any time—that is my problem in a free country, free enterprise, free anything, freedom of speech and you can't hardly live for being afraid that you will be ill-treated by the same kind of animal you are, a human being. I just can't see why the senior citizens of America—

Mr. FAUNTROY. Take your time.

Mr. K. [continuing]. Who have worked hard for this country and in this golden age we are living in can't be respected. We have gotten some promises for things we have asked, we ask who is in authority, just like a father asking a child for anything he wants, and we have gotten so many promises until they done changed the word now. Whenever we say we want something, they tell you right out, no. Whatever we want, if you are sick, hungry—now we are talking about medicaid, food stamps. I made an application. They told me I was too rich, wasn't eligible. But, anyway, that is the way it is today. You, Mr. Roybal, chairman of this subcommittee, we hope you have success in your trip across the country because wherever you go you will find the same thing and you will have the same questions and the people will be looking for the same answer, security. When you use that word, that covers any part of life that you need, have to have or want. Because if you are outdoors you need security. I could say more but at this time, owing to the lateness of the hour and many things to do—I am thankful I had the opportunity to meet one of the leaders of our Government and have the opportunity to let him see how I feel in reference to the senior citizens of the United States of America.⁶³

⁶² From article by B. Bild and R. Havighurst, "Senior Citizens in Great Cities: The Case of Chicago," in *The Gerontologist* vol. 16 No. 1, pt. 2, 1976, pp. 47-52.

⁶³ See "Elderly Crime Victims (Personal Accounts of Fears and Attacks)," p. 20.

FEAR AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Fear of crime in the older population has been the most pervasive and consistent finding of the subcommittee and other major research studies. In 1974 Louis Harris and Associates conducted a comprehensive national survey on the problems of the elderly. One aspect of this study sponsored by the National Council on the Aging (NCOA), was to measure the elderly's perception of various social problems. The elderly ranked fear of crime as the most serious problem they experience. When shown a list of possible problems and asked how serious each was for them personally, 23 percent of those people over 65 said "fear of crime" is a very serious problem. What is particularly significant about this fact is that fear of crime was considered a greater social problem than health, money, and loneliness. In 1971, the Los Angeles Times conducted a poll which showed fear of crime was second only to economic in causing stress.

In 1972 the NRTA/AARP, in conjunction with the University of Michigan, conducted a national survey of 4,500 elderly people to determine their needs and concerns. The results of that survey indicated that fear of crime was ranked second; the only need of greater magnitude was inadequate food and shelter.⁶³

In 1973 NRTA/AARP and the University of Southern California undertook a second national survey with a sample of 77,000. Again crime was ranked as the second item of greatest concern, following food and shelter.⁶⁴

A recent study of the urban aged in Wilmington, Del., determined that 65 percent of the population had a strong fear for their personal safety.⁶⁵

Data from a recent survey by the Chicago Planning Council on Aging revealed that 41 percent of the city's 518,000 residents over 60 felt that crime was their most serious concern.⁶⁶

Another study, using a much smaller number of respondents (516), was also conducted in Chicago by B. Bild and R. Havighurst. The purpose of their study was to determine the major problems of Chicago's elderly and compare them to the national sample (reported above by Louis Harris). Fear of crime was ranked as the most serious problem.

⁶³ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Crime Prevention Programs)," p. 12.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ Information was submitted to the subcommittee as part of the hearing record on "Elderly Crime Victimization (Wilmington, Del., Crime Resistance Task Force)," May 6, 1976.

⁶⁶ From article "The Elderly: Prisoners of Fear," *Time*, Nov. 29, 1976, p. 22.

"Ms. P" addressed the subcommittee at the Los Angeles hearing on September 18, 1976:

Ms. P——. Yes, 7:30. It was still daylight.

Mr. ROYBAL. You mentioned something about—was it a church that you were coming from?

Ms. P——. I was coming out of the temple.

Mr. ROYBAL. Where is that located?

Ms. P——. Hollywood Boulevard. Just a half a block from Hollywood Boulevard and Fuller Avenue.

Mr. ROYBAL. Were you hurt in any way?

Ms. P——. Yes, I was hurt. My finger was broken. When I felt the knife here I let go of the purse. What else can you do.

Mr. ROYBAL. In other words, what he did was approach you from behind with a knife in his hand and applied that knife to your throat.

Ms. P——. That is right. And my friend, if she wouldn't have screamed, God knows what would have happened.

Mr. ROYBAL. But the friend that was with you did scream.

Ms. P——. She screamed, "Fire," and people came out, and that saved my life.

Mr. ROYBAL. The man—

Ms. P——. Two men, a 25-year-old and a 40-year-old.

Mr. ROYBAL. In other words, what they ever apprehended by the police? Did the police catch them? Were they put in jail?

Ms. P——. I don't know. No, not so far as I know.

Mr. ROYBAL. In other words, you don't know if they were caught?

Ms. P——. No. I would know. The detective came up to the house and showed me pictures of them. I didn't identify anybody. I couldn't say who it was.

Mr. ROYBAL. In other words, it was very difficult for you to identify the individual since he approached you from behind.

Ms. P——. No, no. He came from the front.

Mr. ROYBAL. I see. So you did see him.

Ms. P——. Oh yes. Oh yes. I described him, how he looked and everything. But I don't think they were caught.

Mr. ROYBAL. That must have been a very frightening experience.

Ms. P——. It was frightening, of course. It is a great fear. It is not only the fear, it is the insult. I was insulted, hurt that this should happen in our country, a free country. We walk to church. So why should this happen in a community? I live here. I am not a newcomer here. I have lived for 46 years in Los Angeles, and I have lived for 25 years in Hollywood. It shouldn't happen. That is an insult. It hurts. And we are afraid. It is fear. I am not a person to be afraid. I go wherever I have to go on the bus, in the streets. But in the evening, after 7 o'clock, I am afraid to go out. People are afraid to go in to pray on a Friday night. It is fear. I usually call the police. A policeman comes in a car. He goes by. He watches on Friday night. There is fear. When I asked people, "Why didn't you come to the temple," they say, "Are you kidding? I am afraid even with the car to go." Because people are being held up in the parking lot. The same evening I was held up, two other people were held up in the parking lot.

Mr. ROYBAL. On that same day?

Ms. P——. On the same evening. Same time. The money was taken and the wallets were thrown in the gutter. My wallet was also thrown in the gutter.

Mr. ROYBAL. How much money did they take from you, Ms. P——

Ms. P——. If he would have asked me for it, I would have given it to him with pleasure. It was not much. It was only \$15.

Mr. ROYBAL. But nevertheless, \$15 that you really needed. It was your money and there was no reason for him to take it.

Ms. P——. That is right. Senior citizens don't have extra money now.

Mr. ROYBAL. That is correct.

Ms. P——. There is great fear. I hope that the fear problem will be solved so that we can go out after 7 o'clock. We are afraid.

Mr. ROYBAL. Well, I think you have expressed the fear of senior citizens very well.⁶⁹

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 15.

Fear of crime in the elderly population has been well substantiated. Even if this fear is out of proportion to the statistical probability of victimization, or without foundation due to the local environment, the effects are just as debilitating as if the fears are justified. The rate of elderly women being raped may be only 0.3 per thousand population, but if a majority of women are afraid, fear of crime has become a major social problem.⁷⁰

VARIABLES THAT AFFECT FEAR

One aspect of the problem that needed to be determined was how fear is distributed in the elderly population. Are there groups that experience more fear than others? Can the conditions that cause this fear be determined? If it is possible to refine this problem into its component parts, policies and programs can be directed to the areas where the greatest need exists.

A number of recent research projects have attempted to answer these questions. Although each study may weigh or prioritize the variables differently, most cite the following as important components in their relationship to fear in the elderly population: sex, economics, race, and community size.

Sex

All studies reviewed by the subcommittee revealed that women have a higher rate of fear than men. This pattern holds true for the elderly, although the gap between the sexes is reduced. Data from the 1973 and 1974 General Social Surveys, conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago, indicated that:

19 percent of non-aged males reported fear of crime.

60 percent of non-aged females reported fear of crime.

(The difference between non-aged males and females is 41 percent.)

34 percent of aged males reported fear of crime.

69 percent of aged females reported fear of crime.

(The difference between aged males and females is 35 percent.)⁷¹

Economics

People at lower income levels express more fear of crime than people in higher economic strata. The Louis Harris poll reports that of those people with incomes under \$3,000 per year, 31 percent felt that fear of crime was a major social problem as compared to 17 percent of those with incomes of \$15,000 per year or more. This relationship between economics and fear may be justified in light of the fact that poorer people generally live in the inner cities and experience higher victimization rates than their wealthier, suburban cohorts.

An article written by Frank Clemente and Michael B. Kleiman also shows a relationship between fear of crime and income. Of the elderly population with incomes of \$7,000 per year or less, 51 percent indicated a fear of crime. On the other hand, 43 percent of older

⁷⁰ From paper by Frank Clemente and Michael B. Kleiman, "Fear of Crime Among the Aged," *The Gerontologist*, June 1976, p. 208.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 209.

Americans with incomes above \$7,000 per year expressed significant fear.⁷²

Race

Virtually all studies indicated a higher fear of crime in the elderly black population than in the elderly white population. The 1974 Louis Harris survey showed that of those people over 65, 21 percent of the white population as compared to 41 percent of the black population reported crime as a "serious problem for them personally." A further refinement of these statistics made a correlation between race and income. Of those 65 years and over with incomes under \$3,000 per year, 28 percent of the whites and 44 percent of the blacks listed fear of crime as a very serious social problem. These rates declined to 18 percent for the white population and 33 percent for the black population when incomes were over \$3,000.

The Clemente and Kleiman study indicated that while approximately 47 percent of the elderly white population was afraid to walk alone in their neighborhoods at night, this figure increased to 69 percent in the elderly black population.

Community

Community size is positively related to a person's fear of crime.⁷³ The greater the size of the community, the higher the level of fear, according to the Harris polls of 1964, 1966, 1967, 1969, and 1970, and the Gallup polls of 1967, 1968, and 1972. This fact holds true for all age levels in the population, but is most acute among the elderly.

The Clemente and Kleiman study shows that fear in the elderly "decreases in a clear step pattern as one moves from large cities to rural areas."⁷⁴ The study produced the following data showing the percent of the elderly who expressed fear in cities of various sizes:

| Elderly expressing fear | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Percent: | City size |
| 76 | Larger cities (250,000+). |
| 68 | Medium cities (50,000-250,000). |
| 48 | Suburbs of large cities. |
| 43 | Small towns (2,500-50,000). |
| 24 | Rural locations (under 2,500). |

These percentages become even more glaring when compared with the non-elderly respondents (under 65) who expressed fear of crime:

| Nonelderly expressing fear | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Percent: | City size |
| 57 | Larger cities. |
| 47 | Medium cities. |
| 39 | Suburbs of large cities. |
| 40 | Small towns. |
| 25 | Rural location. |

These data clearly indicate that fear of crime is highest in the elderly urban resident. Even when holding the income variable constant, the Clemente and Kleiman study shows urban residents are more afraid than those living in rural areas.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ From article by Sarah L. Boggs, "Formal and Informal Crime Control: An Exploratory Study of Urban, Suburban, and Rural Orientations," in *The Sociological Quarterly*, Summer 1971, pp. 320-328.

⁷⁴ See "Fear of Crime Among the Aged," p. 209.

Richard A. Sundeen and James Mathieu compared the fear of crime of the elderly in a central city environment, an urban middle class municipality, and a suburban retirement community. Their findings also supported the view that central city residents have a significantly higher fear of criminal victimization in their immediate neighborhood than the other two groups.

An interesting fact brought out in their study was that the residents of the guarded security-walled retirement community expressed similarly high fears of victimization in areas that were beyond their compound.⁷⁵

The necessity of analyzing fear and its attendant variables became clear when the subcommittee looked at a study of "Age and Fearfulness," conducted by Barry D. Lebowitz.

When this study measured age and fear generically—without consideration of variables (e.g., sex, race, and city size)—the results were:

| Age | Percent of fear by age | Percent |
|----------|------------------------|---------|
| Under 40 | ----- | 38.0 |
| 40-59 | ----- | 39.5 |
| Over 60 | ----- | 45.0 |

These results are not substantial nor statistically significant. When these same data were analyzed holding a third variable (residence) constant and "inspecting the conditional distributions on a multi-dimensional table," the results are quite different:

TABLE XV.—AGE AND FEARFULNESS⁷⁶
[Percentage fearful by age and place of residence]

| Age | Place of residence | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|--------------------|-------|------------|-------|---------|-------|-------------|-------|------------|-------|
| | Rural | | Small city | | Suburb | | Medium city | | Large city | |
| | Percent | Total | Percent | Total | Percent | Total | Percent | Total | Percent | Total |
| Under 40 | 24 | 135 | 38 | 168 | 31 | 97 | 44 | 88 | 53 | 184 |
| 40 to 59 | 23 | 108 | 37 | 110 | 42 | 84 | 48 | 79 | 60 | 106 |
| Over 60 | 19 | 101 | 39 | 66 | 50 | 34 | 63 | 35 | 71 | 78 |

The difference between fear of crime of the elderly in rural areas (19 percent) and in large cities (71 percent) is apparent from the table. These data were obscured in the generic study because fearfulness is low for the rural residents and high for urban residents; when these figures are combined, they averaged out to a "zero" effect. In other words, the age/fear relationship was suppressed or obscured by the lack of control for place of residence.

These same data were analyzed holding other variables constant—sex, presence of others in household, and income. The results are not as substantial as community size, but are noteworthy. Sex is clearly an important predictor of fear.

⁷⁵ From article by Richard A. Sundeen and James T. Mathieu, "The Fear of Crime and Its Consequences Among Elderly in Three Urban Communities," *The Gerontologist*, 1976, p. 215.

⁷⁶ From article by Barry D. Lebowitz, "Age and Fearfulness: Personal and Situational Factors," *Journal of Gerontology*, November 1973, p. 639.

TABLE XVI.—PERCENTAGE FEARFUL BY AGE, SEX, AND OTHERS IN HOUSEHOLD ⁷⁷

| Age | Sex | | | |
|---------------|---------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
| | Male | | Female | |
| | Percent | Total | Percent | Total |
| Under 40..... | 17 | 316 | 59 | 356 |
| 40 to 59..... | 21 | 218 | 58 | 279 |
| Over 60..... | 25 | 161 | 65 | 153 |
| | Others in household | | | |
| | None | | One or more others | |
| | Percent | Total | Percent | Total |
| Under 40..... | 46 | 41 | 39 | 630 |
| 40 to 59..... | 42 | 31 | 40 | 466 |
| Over 60..... | 56 | 77 | 41 | 237 |

TABLE XVII.—PERCENTAGE FEARFUL BY AGE AND INCOME ⁷⁸

| Age | Income ¹ | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------------|-------|----------|-------|---------|-------|
| | Low | | Moderate | | High | |
| | Percent | Total | Percent | Total | Percent | Total |
| Under 40..... | 37 | 111 | 41 | 182 | 38 | 347 |
| 40 to 59..... | 48 | 58 | 36 | 107 | 41 | 295 |
| Over 60..... | 48 | 134 | 44 | 73 | 35 | 71 |

¹ Low: Under \$5,000 annual family income in 1972; Moderate: \$5,000 to \$10,000 annual family income in 1972; High: Over \$10,000 annual family income in 1972.

Thus the research data indicate that there is a strong fear of crime among the elderly. It is, therefore, important to examine the affect of that fear upon the quality of life of the elderly. Are older Americans in any way altering their behavior or reflecting emotional stress due to the fear of victimization? The following studies address this issue.

RESULTS OF FEAR OF CRIME AND/OR VICTIMIZATION

A current study is being undertaken by Dr. Marlene A. Young Rifai in Multnomah County, Oregon. A central aspect of the research is behavioral changes in the elderly caused by fear of crime. Dr. Rifai stated that, "The general perception of crime by older persons seemed to reflect a great deal of concern."⁷⁹ Some of her findings are:

1. Eighty-four percent would not walk [outside] after dark, with 62 percent attributing this directly to the fear of crime.
2. Almost 25 percent of all those interviewed avoided certain areas in their own neighborhoods due to fear.
3. Sixty-six and two-thirds percent felt their homes would be burglarized.
4. Fifty-four percent avoided certain areas of the city because they felt them to be unsafe, and their perception of the city as a whole was fraught with anxiety.

⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 697 and 698.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 698.

⁷⁹ See "Older Americans Crime Prevention Research," p. 7.

Dr. M. Powell Lawton, et al, studied the elderly and the psychological aspects of crime. They explained that the normal aging process is punctuated by a series of losses. The elderly are generally faced with a reduction in income and with the consequent limited ability to purchase goods and services. While 12-15 percent are partially or totally disabled, 85 percent have one or more chronic illnesses. A significant number of the elderly live in inadequate housing; many have constraints in their access to transportation or difficulty with mobility. Many suffer from poor nutrition. There is a constant reduction in the social network—often loss of spouse, loss of meaningful peer relationships, and loss of role. Any one or combination of these losses is associated with a devaluation of one's self image and a heightened susceptibility to stress.⁸⁰

The report explained how these conditions are related to the threat of a crime. A threat is perceived whether in terms of doubt in one's ability to deal with a problem or the magnitude of the problem. Maintaining a state of appraised threat is always experienced as a "cost" to the person in terms of strain and anxiety, and in extreme situations, this can even result in psychological and physical symptoms.

Living in a high crime-ridden neighborhood poses a chronic threat, requiring constant vigilance to maintain safe, appropriate behavior. This adds enormous stress to an already vulnerable group of people. Any time a threat is perceived, behavior is modified to cope with the threat. The coping mechanism, however, can be adaptive or maladaptive. Many people respond to the fear of crime by minimizing their exposure. Many curtail participation in activities and limit their visiting of friends. Many refuse to go out after dark, and others limit their trips away from home to bare necessities. Although in one sense this reduces the elderly's opportunity for victimization, there are attendant social and psychological losses. By limiting their opportunities for social relationships and essential trips (i.e., doctors, shopping, etc.), many important areas of life satisfaction are blocked, and self-esteem is diminished.

The Harris poll attested to this condition of restricted activity when it disclosed that approximately 25 percent of older people significantly limited their own mobility.

Carl L. Cunningham, in the Kansas City study, analyzed fear of crime through interviews with victims. Some of his major observations were:

1. The most common response of elderly burglarly victims was a reluctance to leave home with a heightened fear of remaining alone in it. Some suffered acute anxiety.
2. Elderly victims of burglary, almost without exception, displayed a long-lasting fear that obviously emanated from a sense of anonymous invasion and latent threat.
3. Criminal invasion of the home, regardless of outcome or loss, usually assumed larger dimensions in the victim's mind than a crime or accident that occurred elsewhere.
4. The majority of burglary victims reported anxiety and a high incidence of voluntary restriction of activity motivated by a generalized fear of crime.

⁸⁰ From article by M. Powell Lawton, Lucille Nahemow, Silvia Yaffe, and Steven Feldman, "Psychological Aspects of Crime and Fear of Crime," in *Crime and the Elderly: Challenge and Response* edited by Jack Goldsmith and Sharon S. Goldsmith, D. C. Heath, Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass., 1976, pp. 21 and 22.

5. Nearly 40 percent of the total burglary and robbery victims did not go places nor engage in certain activities due to a fear of crime.
6. Slightly over 12 percent moved from their homes or sold businesses, citing the burglary and general threat of crime in the neighborhood as the reasons.
7. The most common response to robbery was a general fear and nervousness.
8. About 10 percent of robbery victims changed their work schedules and some abandoned employment as a result of the robbery.
9. The most drastic event was that several reported abandonment of their homes following a robbery or burglary.⁸¹

MORALE AND ENVIRONMENT

It is only recently that studies have been conducted on the relationship between morale and environment in the elderly population. In 1970 a national study of approximately 4,000 people 65 years of age and older demonstrated the importance of environmental factors to morale. The findings suggest that environmental characteristics are more central to maintaining morale than social relationships.⁸² A 1973 study showed "security in one's residence" to be one of the three most significant correlates to quality of life.⁸³ A study of inner city elderly in Philadelphia revealed deprivations in both income and health. Physical security, however, was evaluated by these residents as their most important need. Lawton and Kleban claim that "* * * their spontaneous comments reveal how urgently they fear threats to their physical safety and how deeply this insecurity underlies their difficulty in gaining satisfaction in other areas."⁸⁴

The subcommittee is convinced that fear of crime is a pervasive and onerous problem for older Americans. Women, blacks, and inner-city residents are the groups most profoundly and adversely affected by this fear.

It is also clear that the quality of life for senior citizens is diminished by fear. Many older people limit their participation in social and recreational activities because they are afraid to be on the streets. Some limit their outside activities to only essential trips for food or medical attention. The subsequent losses in life satisfaction and self-esteem are pernicious.

⁸¹ See "Patterns of Crimes Against Older Americans," pp. 38-55.

⁸² From article by Kermit K. Schooler, "Effect of Environment on Morale," *The Gerontologist*, Autumn 1970, p. 196.

⁸³ From article by J. E. O'Brien, "Component of Quality of Life Among Severely Impaired Urban Elderly," *The Gerontologist*, 1973.

⁸⁴ From article by M. Powell Lawton and Morton H. Kleban, "The Aged Resident of the Inner City," *The Gerontologist*, Winter 1971, p. 283.

LOCAL CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Throughout the nation, there are numerous programs that have been designed to impact on criminal victimization of the elderly. Many have been devised by local or state law enforcement agencies, some have been created by social service and aging organizations (both public and private), and some by private businesses. A number of programs began as the concept of a concerned citizen. No matter where the impetus for the program, almost all have evolved into a unified effort of law enforcement and private citizens' groups.

A majority of the programs are educational or training programs designed to teach the elderly how to:

- Avoid street crimes;
- Burglar-proof their homes; and
- Be sensitive to fraud and bunco schemes.

Other types of programs address the:

- Development of community cohesion through locally based crime prevention units;
- Creation of supportive services (e.g., escort services or transportation) to minimize vulnerability;
- Provision of assistance to recent victims of crimes; and
- Treatment of the offender or potential offender.

Implicit in almost all of these programs is an attempt to reduce the fear of crime in older Americans.

Although there is no question that the above categories are arbitrary, and that many programs could be classified under more than one heading, they are used here to indicate a unique feature of a program. There are also multiphasic programs that operate in all or almost all of the categories. These, too, have been listed in a category which emphasizes an exceptional feature of the program.

Although it is beyond the scope of this report to include every program that is operating nationally in the area of elderly crime victimization, the subcommittee would like to provide a description of each type of program that has been encountered. If more detailed information is desired, the names of organizations or agencies, contact persons, and their telephone numbers have been included whenever possible.

The LEAA through the block grant program supports a number of programs which aid state and local law enforcement agencies. In the April 12, 1976, hearing before this subcommittee, Henry F. McQuade, Deputy Administrator for Policy Development, explained how LEAA funds are distributed:

The major portion of program funds is distributed to the states on a population formula basis. Each state, through a designated state planning agency, distributes these funds in accordance with a comprehensive statewide plan for improvement of law enforcement and criminal justice. The plan reflects the state's determination of its own needs and priorities. LEAA neither approves nor disapproves applications for grant funds under the jurisdiction of the state planning agencies.⁸⁵

⁸⁵ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Federal Law Enforcement Agencies—LEAA and FBI)," p. 5.

LEAA also uses monies from its discretionary fund to sponsor programs that are innovative and have national application. Mr. McQuade continued, "Of the total appropriation available to implement part C of our enabling legislation, which is the authority under which most of our action programs operate, 15 percent is reserved for such discretionary use." A number of the LEAA funded programs have been developed to assist the elderly. They will be discussed along with programs developed by other agencies of the criminal justice system and community based programs.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

The thrust of most elderly victimization programs is education or training. Probably the most well-developed program of this type to date, was created by NRTA/AARP.

The NRTA/AARP has created the only national program directed specifically to the prevention of crime against the elderly on a community-wide basis. They have developed a very comprehensive manual and training program emphasizing the prevention of crime through personal action. Though the program was originally designed for use in their local chapters, it is now being made available to nutrition centers and civic, church, and private organizations. The goals of their program are to teach techniques to the older adult so that he can avoid or minimize criminal victimization, reduce criminal opportunity, and reduce unwarranted and exaggerated fear.

The training program is divided into four 2-hour sessions:

1. Street crimes—the most prevalent crimes and how to avoid them;
2. Burglarly—how to protect the home;
3. Fraud/bunco—confidence schemes, bunco, and white collar crime; and
4. Community and police relations—how the older citizen can work with professionals to reduce crime.

This program has also developed a workshop for law enforcement officials. In these sessions, the emphasis is on sensitizing the law enforcement professional to the specific crime-related problems of the elderly.

For more information, contact Charles Schafer, NRTA/AARP Crime Prevention Program, 1909 "K" Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20049; (202) 872-4700.

Los Angeles has created an "Interagency Task Force on Crime Against the Elderly." The State Attorney General's office, local law enforcement agencies, city and county area agencies on aging, social service agencies, libraries, and educational institutions⁸⁰ worked together to design educational programs dealing with violence, burglary, consumer fraud, and bunco. Service providers throughout the county involved in the aging network were trained in seminars so that they could conduct crime prevention programs in their local

⁸⁰ Other groups involved were the State Office on Aging, Los Angeles County District Attorney, Los Angeles Bureau of Consumer Affairs, Los Angeles County Probation Department, and the Los Angeles County Public Guardian.

organizations or communities. Public service radio and television spot announcements on the prevention of crime against the elderly were prepared by the local public television station, KCET. These are available for use in other cities. The television public service announcements provide basic crime prevention information. Slides using senior citizens of all ethnic groups, very creative graphics, and voice-overs by television personalities make this a very persuasive product.

For more information, contact:

Leon Harper, Director, Los Angeles County Department of Senior Citizens Affairs, 601 South Kinglsey Drive, Los Angeles, Calif. 90005; (213) 385-4221.

June Sherwood, Office of the Attorney General, Crime Prevention Unit, 3580 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 938, Los Angeles, Calif. 90010; (213) 620-3286.

Dr. Roy Azarnoff, Director, Los Angeles Office for the Aging, Room 2100, City Hall, 200 North Spring St., Los Angeles, Calif. 90012; (213) 485-4402.

James Mathis, KCET Educational Services, 4400 Sunset Drive, Los Angeles, Calif., 90027; (213) 666-6500.

In 1972 California Attorney General Evelle J. Younger began a crime prevention and consumer protection program for senior citizens. The emphasis of the program is a partnership between older Californians and the criminal justice department. The objectives of the program are:

1. To alert and inform senior citizens in the community about consumer fraud, street crime, bunco, and burglary as it would affect their age group, and present methods of avoiding such incidents;
2. To inform older persons of their rights and entitlements under laws governing health, welfare, consumerism, and crime;
3. To inform seniors where and how to complain if victimized;
4. To inform and orient local law enforcement and regulatory agencies regarding crime and consumer fraud problems of the elderly; and
5. To train and organize senior volunteers throughout the state to act as crime prevention chairpersons in local senior centers, neighborhoods and organizations.

The Consumer Information and Protection Program For Seniors (CIPPS) is predicated on the belief that any crime prevention program must involve the citizen if it is to be effective.

The CIPPS method is to hold a day-long conference for older persons, or representatives of senior citizen groups in their local community. At the conference, information is provided on street safety, purse snatching, mugging, bunco, sales gimmicks, health frauds, medical quackery, etc. The presentations are made by experts in these fields—policemen specializing in street crimes, sheriffs with specialties in protection and neighborhood organizing, district attorneys, and fraud specialists. Brochures are provided to participants so that they can review the material at other times and also to assist them in presenting a similar program to their own nutrition site, senior center, church group, or whatever group they are involved with. A major thrust of the one-day program is to encourage the older participants to become community crime preventers and to organize programs of their own. Updated and continuous training in crime prevention is carried on through a bi-monthly newspaper, Senior

Crime Preventers' Bulletin. This paper is free and is mailed by the attorney general's office to anyone who requests it. The bulletin reviews and supplements information provided at the conference. It also gives the most current suggestions and ideas available. Many of the innovative ideas are sent in by the readers themselves.

For more information, contact Melanie Ingram, Staff Services Analyst, Office of the Attorney General, Crime Prevention Unit, 3580 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 938, Los Angeles, Calif. 90010; (213) 736-2372.

The Center for Studies in Aging at North Texas State University in Denton, Tex., has been researching and analyzing crimes and their impact on the elderly. The research has culminated in the development of training materials, video tapes, and handbooks for the elderly with a special emphasis on increasing elderly crime reporting. The center has also developed training materials for use by police departments.

For more information, contact Dr. Marvin Ernst, Center for Studies in Aging, North Texas State University, Denton, Tex. 76203; (817) 788-2181.

The Multnomah County Division of Public Safety in Portland, Oreg., has been doing research on criminal victimization of the elderly. This program is funded by an LEAA state block grant. Although the program has not been completed, its objectives are:

- Reduction of crime;
- Reduction of fear;
- Improving communication between older people and the criminal justice system; and
- Understanding the environment of criminal victimization of older Americans.

For more information, contact Dr. Marlene A. Young Rifai, Multnomah County Division of Public Safety, 10525 Southeast Cherry Blossom Drive, No. 101, Portland, Oreg. 97216; (503) 255-1891.

The International Association of Chiefs of Police is developing a model project called Crime, Safety, and the Senior Citizen. Its two major goals are developing crime prevention programs for senior citizens and establishing a plan to utilize volunteers in local law enforcement agencies. These programs are currently being implemented and evaluated in five demonstration cities: Jersey City, New Jersey; Mansfield, Ohio; Miami Beach, Fla.; Omaha, Nebr.; and Syracuse, N.Y. When the demonstration is completed, a "Model Procedures" will be developed. The model will be made available to other agencies.

For more information, contact Philip J. Gross, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Technical Research Services Division, 11 Firstfield Road, Gaithersburg, Md. 20760; (301) 948-0922.

The mayor's office of Baltimore ⁸⁷ has developed three 1½ hour video taped training modules that deal with crimes of assault, robbery, and burglary. Each tape focuses on the behaviors, skills, and procedures senior citizens should utilize if confronted with these crimes. The training program includes discussion techniques and role-playing activities which facilitate the learning of these new skills. The program is funded by LEAA.

For more information, contact the Mayor's Coordinating Council on Criminal Justice, Holiday and Lexington Sts., Room 342 Baltimore, Md. 21202; (301) 396-4370.

The Senior Safety and Security Program ⁸⁸ in Cleveland, Ohio, has developed a plan to teach crime prevention techniques to the elderly. It is funded through LEAA. They have prepared slide presentations and role playing exercises as teaching tools. They also train volunteers to put on safety presentations, assist with Operation Identification, and make home security checks.

For more information, contact Fred D. Middleton, Director, Senior Safety and Security Program, 1276 West 3rd St., Marion Bldg., No. 512, Cleveland, Ohio 44113; (216) 623-7000.

The Miami Beach Police Department ⁸⁹ has developed education programs to reduce criminal activity. They are also attempting to increase the rate of recovery of stolen property through Project Identification. Another aspect of this program is the development of community coordination in the areas of social services and the criminal justice system.

For more information, contact Sgt. Nicholas Valeriani, Miami Beach Police Department, 120 Meridian Ave., Miami Beach, Fla. 33139; (305) 673-7998.

The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) ⁹⁰ in Kansas City, Mo., has been funded as a national demonstration program by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the Administration on Aging. Their program consists of three areas—education, community crime prevention, and elderly victim assistance.

The education component attempts to decrease unrealistic perceptions and fears of crime of the elderly in specific areas. On the other hand, they inform the elderly of crime categories in which they are more vulnerable. There is added concentration of assistance in

⁸⁷ Other groups involved were the Baltimore City Commission on Aging and Retirement Education and the Baltimore City Police Department.

⁸⁸ Other groups involved were the Guyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority, the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) offices in Cleveland, East Cleveland, and Parma, and the Victims Assistance Program.

⁸⁹ Also involved were Citizen Crime Watch, Miami Beach agencies concerned with the elderly, Health Planning Council of South Florida, Jewish Family and Children's Service, Dade County Department of Human Resources, Senior Centers of Dade County, Miami Beach Office of Social Services, Douglas Gardens Jewish Home for the Aged, Miami Beach Housing Authority, and Jewish Vocational Services.

⁹⁰ Other groups involved were the Midwest Research Institute, the Greater Kansas City Mental Health Foundation, and the Kansas City Missouri Police Department.

geographic areas that have been identified as having higher proportions of elderly victimization.

MARC's community crime prevention program includes home security inspections, Operation Identification, target hardening,⁹¹ Neighborhood Watch, and residential and personal security training. The victim assistance program aids victims of crime by providing financial assistance, and by serving as a link with health and social service agencies.

For more information, contact Cindy Fern, Mid-America Regional Council, 20 West 9th St. Kansas City, Mo. 64105; (816) 474-4240.

COMMUNITY COHESION⁹² THROUGH LOCALLY BASED CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Throughout the subcommittee's research on elderly crime victimization, one concept continually appeared—professional law enforcement agencies are limited in their ability to respond to crime due to the magnitude of offenses, constraints in their personnel time, and funding. Since 1960 there has been an extraordinary increase in criminal activity. Robbery has increased 255 percent; rape, 243 percent; assault, 153 percent; and murder, 100 percent.⁹³ Another factor which exacerbates this problem is the distribution of law enforcement officers in the community. In Los Angeles, for example, the ratio of officers is set at one per 2,000 citizens. This ratio, however, is misleading for the rate is decreased by a number of factors:

1. Law enforcement officers that are employed in supervisory and managerial positions;
2. Officers that are ill;
3. Officers that are on vacation; and
4. Officers that are testifying in court.

In Los Angeles the actual ratio of officers on the street or in patrol cars to citizens, is one per 7,000.

These statistics clearly indicate the dimensions of the problem. In response to this situation, law enforcement and criminal justice officials at every level of government advocate the creation of supplementary, community action crime prevention programs. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals stated that, "Action by private citizens is at the heart of community crime prevention."⁹⁴ Without doubt this is a shift from the traditional view which relied on professionals to prevent and control criminal activity.

A community crime prevention program generally begins with a group of citizens working in a unified effort to reduce the incidence of crime in their area. It is based upon the precept that individuals, by supplementing their knowledge, minimally altering their environment and behavior, and increasing their linkages in the community, can significantly reduce the possibility of victimization.

There are a number of programs based upon this thesis.

⁹¹ Target hardening is the attempt to prevent breaking and entering into residences by the installation of security devices, for example, locks.

⁹² This concept is discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

⁹³ Preliminary figures for 1978 issued by the FBI reveal a decrease in violent crime in the nation but an increase in property crimes. This may indicate a subsequent increase of crimes perpetrated against older Americans.

⁹⁴ From article by Jack Goldsmith, "Community Crime Prevention and the Elderly: A Segmental Approach," *Crime Prevention Review*, July 1975, p. 19.

Neighborhood Watch is a community-based crime prevention program. It began in the City of Los Angeles about 5 years ago under Police Chief Edward Davis. A program frequently begins when the police review crime reports and notice an area that has had an increase in crime rates—usually burglary and robbery. An officer will then contact someone in the area, often a victim, and suggest that he gather his neighbors together for an evening meeting with the officers who patrol their district. The police officers will then put on a program which demonstrates the best methods of burglary prevention. If requested, they will make more than one visit to assist the group and discuss other crime problems that the particular community is experiencing. The police also meet with service groups, business and professional groups, and churches to inform people of the benefits of beginning a Neighborhood Watch Program.

Some of the benefits of this program are that it is inexpensive to operate, is adaptable to the needs of each community, and requires little intervention from law enforcement agencies after the program has begun.

Interviews with various police leadership elicit the same response—that Neighborhood Watch can be the most effective program ever developed for crime prevention. It can provide "eyes and ears"—sensitive to anything unusual—on every block in the community. No police force is large enough to accomplish that. Some of the main features of the program are:

1. Learning to identify the people and cars that belong on the block;
2. Learning how to burglar-proof one's home (illustrated pamphlets have been developed and are available free of cost);
3. Learning how to prevent street robbery and rape; and
4. Developing a spirit of mutual help so that neighbors will join together to reduce the potential for crime.

It is now the official program of the National Sheriffs' Association, under Executive Director Ferris E. Lucas. The Association is funded by LEAA for this program and provides technical assistance and training materials to local Neighborhood Watch groups.

For more information, contact William Petersen, National Sheriffs' Association, 1250 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 320, Washington, D.C. 20036; (202) 872-0422.

"Blow the Whistle on Crime" is a citizen involvement program that began in Los Angeles and has been implemented in 300 cities nationally. It is generally an adjunct to a city's own crime prevention program. The thrust of the program is to put whistles in the hands of every person (in this case, senior citizens) and encourage them to carry the whistle while on the street. The whistle provides a method for a citizen to be legally armed with a device that can often thwart an attack or summon aid if an attack has occurred. The advantages of the whistle are twofold: 1) many criminals flee at the first sign of attention being drawn, and 2) often people become aware of the incident and are able to describe or identify the suspect.

Funds to purchase the whistles generally come from businesses and local merchants. They buy the whistles which include a key ring and luminous key tab. On the key tab they can imprint their company's name and local emergency telephone numbers. The whistles are then distributed free of charge to the elderly through senior citizen organizations. This provides advertising for the company and a service to the community.

It is also important, if beginning the program, to utilize publicity—radio, television, and newspapers. Citizens need to be aware of the whistles, and they also need to be encouraged to respond if they hear one blown.

For more information, contact Bernie Stern, 177 South Gardner St. Los Angeles, Calif. 90036; (213) 934-3554.

The Citizen Local Alliance for a Safer Philadelphia (CLASP) which is funded by LEAA has developed a community-oriented crime prevention program. One segment of the program is "Senior Safety." An education program for the elderly has been developed, including a pamphlet entitled, "Senior Citizens Safety Hints." CLASP also recommends a freon horn to be used as a signal of distress on the streets or at home and has written a pamphlet called "Freon Horn Safety Hints."⁹⁵ An important aspect of their program is inclusion of senior citizens in all community programs and in participation with the neighborhood crime prevention activities. Senior citizens are taught to be block leaders, participate in neighborhood walks, and counsel victims of crime.

For more information, contact Ellie Wegener, Executive Director, CLASP, 1710 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 19103; (215) 732-4288.

Maricopa County, Ariz., has evolved the most inclusive community participant crime prevention program in the nation.⁹⁶ The county is very extensive (9226 square miles) and, therefore, has special needs. This area, which includes Phoenix, is one of the fastest growing population centers in the country and is also a well known tourist area. These factors had become a lure to both the professional and amateur thief. The county took an innovative approach to reduce crime. They augmented the sheriff's staff of 488 with a volunteer Community Resources Division of 2,500 men and women (between the ages of 18 and 80). The volunteers are organized into 36 posses or community service groups. The crime prevention posses are involved in security training and community relations.

The largest of the volunteer posses is in Sun City, a retirement community 20 miles northwest of Phoenix. Sun City is unincorporated and dependent upon the Maricopa County Sheriff's Department for protection.

The three patrol cars allocated to this area were not sufficient to handle the needs of 30,000 people. Because it was a well known retirement area, it became a target for burglary and robbery. The posse

⁹⁵ The subcommittee recommends the freon horn over the whistle.

⁹⁶ From article by Glenn White, "Where Citizens Help Control Crime," *Dynamic Maturity*, July 1975, p. 14.

members maintain an almost constant patrol in every section of the city. They work in two-person teams, patrol in their own unmarked cars, supply their own uniforms, and purchase and operate their own equipment. So that they could keep in contact with the Phoenix Sheriff's Department, 34 community organizations contributed funds to purchase a ten-unit, mobile radio communications system. The volunteers have also organized an extensive Neighborhood Watch program. Participants in this program keep watch over their neighbor's home, especially at those times when the neighbor is away. They are trained to be aware of unusual and suspicious activity. Anything unusual is reported by telephone to the Sheriff's Department. The volunteers have also implemented Operation I.D. They also observe (in plain clothes) in shopping areas; this program has reduced the amount of purse snatching.

The members of the Sun City posse are unusually qualified for the job. Almost 50 of them are former police officers—some former police chiefs in Eastern and Midwestern cities. Some of the other members include former attorneys, judges, professors, and executives.

Captain Marvin Van Dera, the commander of the Sun City posse, said, "We are a volunteer organization and our mission is to protect. We are willing to devote our time, our cars and our gas to protect Sun City." Their program appears to be working because the incidence of crime has significantly decreased. In late 1974 the Arizona State Insurance Department reported that Sun City had the lowest burglary rate of any large community in Maricopa County.

For more information, contact Sgt. Don Blankenship, Bureau of Crime Resistance, Maricopa County Sheriff's Department, 120 South First Ave., Phoenix, Ariz. 85003; (602) 262-1124.

The National Elderly Victimization Prevention and Assistance Program was initiated in 1975 by the Community Relations—Social Development Commission (CR-SDC) of Milwaukee, Wis., and was recently funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Administration on Aging, the Community Services Administration, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.⁹⁷ The program is concerned with improving the quality of life of elderly residents of the inner city areas of the nation's large urban centers (pop. 500,000). Crime, particularly the personal crime of violence, is believed to be the force which most seriously undermines the quality of life for elderly citizens. The major goals of the program are to prevent crimes against the elderly person and to minimize the impact of crime on those who have been victimized. The program will be accomplished through a combination of national projects, local projects, and research and demonstration. The local projects will emphasize citizen participation and neighborhood strengthening. On the national level, there will be an ongoing consortium developing policy and attempting to focus public and governmental attention on this issue. There will also be legal assistance and ongoing research. The National Council of Senior Citizens will administer the national program.

⁹⁷ The following six cities were funded: New York, N.Y.; Chicago, Ill.; New Orleans, La.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Milwaukee, Wis.; and Washington, D.C.

The project has developed five component parts which can be incorporated into an individual city program. The five components are:

Component A.—Activities designed to strengthen public policy and public programs in the area of the victimization of the elderly based upon citizen participation and initiative.

Component B.—Comprehensive victim assistance activities.

Component C.—Activities which educate and counsel this risk population in crime avoidance and social service availability.

Component D.—Residential neighborhood strengthening activities which have the quality of life of elderly persons as a top priority.

Component E.—Activities which increase the physical security of the residences of elderly persons in high crime areas.

Individual cities that participated in the program would have to incorporate project components A and B. The remaining three are optional.

Paralleling the five project components are ten goals. Each goal is accompanied by specific projects and activities to assist in the achievement of the objectives. The first three goals relate to the national program. They are:

1. To reduce elderly victimization on a national basis through continuing research and demonstration projects in six cities so that these projects will provide skills and knowledge which can be applied in other cities;
2. To integrate and improve the governmental response to the social problem of elderly victimization through a continuing program of analysis and action; and
3. To reduce elderly victimization by conducting research which will make future programs and projects more effective.

The next two goals are related to the local projects and are required components.

4. To reduce the incidence of elderly victimization by providing a mechanism which will develop citizen participation and which will focus community resources on the solution of this problem; and
5. To reduce the impact of crime on elderly victims by means of immediate and comprehensive assistance to these victims.

The remaining goals are optional.

6. To reduce the incidence of elderly victimization through the provision of educational experiences for elderly persons residing in high crime areas;
7. To reduce the incidence of elderly victimization through strengthening the capacity of the residential neighborhood to protect elderly persons and preserve their quality of life;
8. To reduce the incidence of elderly victimization through activities which increase the security of the residence of the elderly person in high crime areas;
9. To increase the skill of elected officials, urban planners, and criminal justice personnel by continually improving programmatic efforts to prevent elderly victimization through demonstration and action research; and

10. To involve elderly persons in the solution of the problem of elderly victimization through the provision of meaningful employment and volunteer activities within this project.

The National Elderly Victimization Prevention and Assistance Program provides a unique approach to the problem. It is the first national and local multi-faceted program directed to the reduction of crime against the elderly in urban areas. The proposal is built upon an unusual technique in law enforcement—a total systems approach.

The criminal justice system, the welfare system, and the mental health system are all components of the larger sphere. These systems and others that are often overlooked are included in this program—the characteristics of the residents, geographical factors, traffic flow, and housing. Each subsystem is studied to see how it can be utilized or altered to best reduce criminal victimization of the elderly. For example, some of the activities in the proposal are directed at maximizing home safety; other activities focus on developing neighborhood organizations, and other activities are addressed to the criminal justice system.

Two of the important features of this program are:

Its recognition of the neighborhood as a primary factor in crime control; and

Its inclusion of the elderly as a full participant and a beneficiary of the program.

For more information, contact either Edward J. J. Olson or Anthony J. Maggiore, Community Relations—Social Development Commission, 161 West Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, Wis. 53203; (414) 272-5600.

If there is concern about the feasibility of organizing a citizen-based crime prevention program in an area with marked economic and social disorganization, a group to contact is the Sav-More Community Security Program in Roxbury, Mass. Although this program was not developed to assist the elderly, the strategies and experiences provide useful guidance.

The Sav-More program operates in a 21 block, high crime area of greater Boston. There are approximately 5,000 residents. Fifty percent are under 21 years of age, 93 percent are black, and 27 percent live beneath the poverty level. Sav-More residents have a high level of unemployment, poor health, and housing problems. With conditions such as these, crime (also a serious problem) had not been given much attention.

Due to the efforts of the program, Sav-More has developed a "House Watch Contract," Operation I.D., improved reporting of crimes, and cooperation with the police department. The members of the community have developed the belief that they can work together to protect themselves.

For more information, contact Ralph Agee, Sav-More Community Security Program, Roxbury Multi-Service Center, 310 Blue Hill Ave., Roxbury, Mass. 02121; (617) 427-4470.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES PROGRAMS

"Senior Citizens Crime Prevention" of New York City is a program that combines supportive services and crime prevention education. It is funded by LEAA and the New York State Division of Criminal Justice. It is well-g geared to urban centers with large elderly populations. The program began in the Bronx. The Bronx Office for the Aging (OFTA), the Bronx Foundation for Senior Citizens, and police officers from the 44th Precinct have cooperated in this ongoing program for the elderly. Evidence of the need for a crime prevention program was derived in two ways. To begin with, there was statistical indication of a rising crime rate in the area. But equally significant was the fact that older persons who came to the OFTA office for advice on housing, medicare, social security, etc., spent more time discussing their fear of crime. In discussions with the older residents, it also became clear that the police station, located 20 blocks away, was too inaccessible for many of them to bother reporting crime, and to some it was too foreboding.

The program that developed is in response to the particular needs of this community. Police officers and detectives from the 44th Precinct would, on a regular schedule, spend several hours a week at the storefront headquarters of OFTA. They advise and counsel the elderly on how to prevent being robbed and being the victim of bunco and confidence schemes. They also teach the elderly what to do if they are approached by a criminal. Brochures in several languages were written that were particularly relevant to seniors in that community (e.g., advice for people on subways) and were printed as a public service by a local bank in cooperation with the county and city office on aging.

The store front facility is also used by the police to interview the elderly who have been crime victims. The police find that registering the complaint in a familiar neighborhood setting has a soothing effect on the older victim. Being located in an aging center offers many other supportive services. There are professionals and trained aids who provide counseling. If necessary, the center is able to provide emergency financial assistance. The center has also trained people in the procedures necessary to replace medicare, medicaid, and social security cards.

This program has expanded from the Bronx to Manhattan, and they are attempting to reach more areas and ultimately the entire city. The training program is now citywide under a grant from the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council.

For more information, contact Elaine Walsh, Director, 155 West 72nd St., New York, N.Y.; (212) 874-0724.

The National Center on Black Aged in Washington, D.C., is operating a crime prevention program in Springfield, Mass. The main objective is to provide escort services and transportation to the elderly so that they can reach their destinations safely. The service takes the elderly to medical appointments, social service agencies, senior centers, churches, and visiting friends and family. They are also escorted and transported back to their homes. The project has been servicing 2,000 senior citizens per month.

For more information, contact Dr. Dolores Davis, Executive Director, National Center on Black Aged, 1730 "M" St., N.W., Suite 811, Washington, D.C. 20036; (202) 785-8766.

The Chicago Police Department has developed another constellation of supportive services and training programs. In the training plan, emphasis is put on teaching preventative measures, observation, and the appropriate response to suspicious activity in the community. They also stress the development of cohesion between senior citizens as a method of reducing the fear of crime.

Services are provided that minimize the seniors' exposure on the streets. Check cashing protection is provided. Various health agencies go to senior citizen complexes. Police community service aids are available to accompany seniors on trips, picnics, meetings, or any occasions in which they would be exposed to victimization.

For more information, contact Ira Harris, Chicago Police Department, 1121 South State St., Chicago, Ill. 60605; (312) 744-5490.

The Detroit Police Department, along with a variety of agencies,⁹⁸ has developed a multi-phased program to reduce crime in a low income, poor mobility, high crime area. All the phases operate simultaneously:

1. Education—there is a program on crime prevention;
2. Transportation—a program was established through the Southeast Michigan Transit Authority and Alpha Corporation (a transportation and communication agency) which provides free transportation to senior citizens who live in the project area within the county;
3. Operation Identification—a program which provides engraving tools to etch an identification number on valuable belongings;
4. Facilitation of check cashing—a program for seniors who frequently lack enough identification, also the endorsement of a direct deposit system; and
5. Telephone reassurance—a program conducted by volunteers in which they contact isolated, ill, and handicapped senior citizens.

The project has also established an emergency food and clothing program. Donations of food and clothing are kept and distributed to senior citizens on an emergency basis.

For more information, contact Police Officer Wayne W. Bradley, Detroit Police Department, 3165 Second Ave., Detroit, Mich. 48201; (313) 224-1225.

The Huntington Police Department⁹⁹ in West Virginia operates a very comprehensive telephone reassurance program. They provide a daily check-in telephone service to the handicapped and senior citizens.

⁹⁸ Other groups involved were the Job Corps, City National Bank, Wayne State University, Detroit Institute of Technology, Cass Corridor Youth Advocates, Manpower, National Bank of Detroit, and the Alpha Corporation.

⁹⁹ Also involved were the Community Mental Health Center, the Department of Welfare, Southwestern Community Action Council, and the Boys Clubs of Huntington.

If a telephone call is not received by a predetermined time, a call is placed to the person. If there is no response, an ambulance is dispatched to see if assistance is required. The department also uses its police reserve to check on the homes of people who are away.

For more information, contact Robert E. Harris, Huntington Police Department, Crime Prevention Unit, Huntington, W. Va. 25717; (304) 696-5575.

The Brigham City Police Department in Utah has created the Senior Citizens Law Enforcement Involvement Program. Besides conducting Neighborhood Watch and education programs, they provide special security services to senior citizens. Some of the services are telephone check-in, bus service, and a security check of the home with an emphasis on locks, and target hardening.

For more information, contact Jay Herbert, Brigham City Police Department, 20 North Main St., Brigham City, Utah 84302; (801) 723-3421.

The Jersey City, N.J., police department conducts education programs to reduce criminal opportunity. They present demonstrations on security devices and conduct safety checks in residences. A special program which they have developed is the senior citizen shopping program. The police department, in conjunction with the Department of Human Resources, has provided buses that go to designated locations, pick up the elderly, and take them to specific shopping areas. This service is provided at no cost to the senior citizen.

For more information, contact Police Officer James P. Hart, Crime Prevention Unit, Jersey City Police Department, 282 Central Ave., Jersey City, N.J. 07307; (201) 433-2500 ext. 377 or 378.

In South Bend, Ind., the police department established a program to reduce the vulnerability to robbery by low income, senior citizen home owners. The program was developed with LEAA funds. In the future it will be funded by a Community Development Block Grant. For those applicants who qualified, security devices were installed in their homes free of charge. Applicants had to be 60 years old or above, have an annual income of \$5,000 or less, and limited savings (\$2,000 or less). The house itself had to be of relatively good construction so that the hardware could be installed. For those senior citizens who are above the income or personal property level, the cost of the locks ranges between \$16 and \$21. The expense of installation brings the entire cost to about \$24 per lock. The department is hoping to utilize the services of people from the Community Employment Training Act (CETA), and therefore eliminate any installation charge.

For more information, contact Sgt. Joel H. Wolvos, South Bend Police, 701 West Sample St., South Bend, Ind.; (219) 284-9265.

The Mayor's Office for Senior Citizens in St. Louis, Mo., and the Metropolitan Police Department,¹⁰⁰ under a grant from the National

¹⁰⁰ Also involved were the Women's Crusade against Crime, 40 senior citizens centers, the Human Development Corporation, the welfare department of the City of St. Louis, Mo., and Manpower Training Center.

Council on Aging, as part of Project Esteem (funded by the U.S. Department of Commerce) employs 100 older workers to help protect other senior citizens. They are trained to install locks, mail slots, door viewers, security screens, and do minor maintenance. They also work with the police department's crime prevention unit to perform security inspections of homes.

For more information, contact John Kelly, Director, Mayor's Office for Senior Citizens, 560 Delmar Blvd., St. Louis, Mo. 63101; (314) 621-5600.

The Neighborhood Security Aide Program in Milwaukee, Wis., provides a number of valuable services in areas that have a large elderly population and a high rate of crime. The program provides aides who patrol the area on foot. These aides are also an outreach network. They inform neighborhood residents about the different agencies and programs that would be of assistance to them. The aides work as an escort service—taking the elderly to stores, banks, nutrition sites, doctors, appointments, etc. The aides are trained to evaluate existing home security measures and make recommendations for improved methods.

The emphasis in this program is to make it possible for the elderly to walk on the streets and utilize community resources without fear of being victimized. The program also attempts to develop a greater public involvement in crime prevention, and reestablish "a sense of trust and mutual support among neighborhood residents." With a greater sense of security, it is believed that the elderly will also make greater use of the existing social services which will increase the quality of their lives.

For more information, contact Mr. William W. Chase, Director, Neighborhood Security Aide Program, Room 1, Courthouse, Ground Floor, 901 North 9th St., Milwaukee, Wis. 53233; (414) 278-5021.

The Syracuse Housing Authority Security Project, using LEAA funds, has established eight security units in low income public housing for the elderly. Off-duty policemen patrol these units and help the elderly to develop specialized security measures.

For more information, contact Carol Shepard, Syracuse Housing Authority, 516 Burt St., Syracuse, N.Y. 13202; (315) 475-6181.

In Plainfield, N.J., a project entitled, "Residential Security Aids Close Circuit TV Senior Citizen Housing," uses a close circuit TV system in high rise housing projects for the elderly to control access to the buildings and prevent victimization. It is funded by an LEAA block grant.

For more information, contact Roland L. Turpin, Executive Director, Plainfield Housing Authority, 510 East Front St., Plainfield, N.J. 07060; (201) 753-3454.

VICTIM ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The Fort Lauderdale, Fla., police department has a well-developed "Victim Advocate Program." The two professional staff members work with the police to assist any victim of a reported crime. They function as a liaison with community service agencies to assist the victim with any needs for housing, transportation, or medical assistance. Often a victim of crime is unaware of assistance that is available or is too injured or traumatized to take advantage of existing programs. Although this program was not developed for the elderly, its goals and objectives are applicable for their utilization.

For more information, contact Jim Fogarty or Shelley A. Bauman, Police Department, City of Fort Lauderdale, 1300 West Broward Blvd., Fort Lauderdale, Fla. 33312; (305) 761-2143.

The Bronx Area Senior Citizen Robbery Unit in New York¹⁰¹ provides a number of unique services. The main job of the officers is to investigate robberies committed against the elderly and to arrest the offenders. They have, however, developed a much broader concentration. They educate the elderly in ways to avoid becoming a victim. They have also taken the time to develop skills to facilitate communication with the elderly. They have coordinated their work with the local social service agency so that they can quickly respond to the needs of a person who has just been victimized. Their assistance to crime victims continues as they assist them through the criminal justice system.

The unit consists of ten officers. They have developed detailed knowledge of all the robberies committed in the area. They invest extensive detective work into each case and become aware of trends which facilitate the apprehension of offenders. The unit has a 95 percent conviction rate. The officers have achieved an understanding of the special needs of the elderly and have adapted their program to their clients.

Some of the elderly do not report crime because they fear reprisal; others because of illness or the hardship of going to the precinct station and court. The unit responded to this by conducting interviews in the homes of the elderly. To simplify the court process, a special telephone system was set up with the Bronx district attorney's office. This allows the elderly victim to stay at home or at a senior center but still be in telephone contact during a trial. When it is necessary for the victim to appear at the trial, a member of the unit transports the individual to court and back home.

The success of this program has led to its extension in all five boroughs in New York City.

For more information, contact Sgt. James Bolte, New York City Police Department, Bronx Area Senior Citizens Robbery Unit, 450 Cross Bronx Expressway, Bronx, N.Y. 10457; (212) 220-5395.

The Fresno County Probation Department had Federal and state grants to establish a victim assistance program. Although the program is not directed specifically to the elderly, they are given special attention when they are victimized. A personal contact is attempted in each

¹⁰¹ Other groups involved were the Mayor's Office of the Aging, the Jewish Association for Service to the Aging, and the Bronx Chamber of Commerce.

case in which an elderly person is involved. The victims of serious crimes are assisted with representation in court. If needed, they are provided with transportation to and from court. The probation department also includes a letter to judges making them aware of the personal and financial losses incurred by the victim of the crime.

For more information, contact Kay McGinty, Fresno County Probation, P. O. Box 453, Fresno, Calif. 93709; (209) 488-3406.

Aid to Victims of Crime, Inc., in St. Louis, Mo.,¹⁰² develops resources and provides services to victims of crime. They also attempt to sensitize the criminal justice system to the problems of victims of crime.

For more information, contact either Joseph P. Mueller or Ann Slaughter, Aid to Victims of Crime, Inc., University Club Bldg., 607 North Grand, Room 705, St. Louis, Mo. 63103; (314) 531-2597.

The Eastern Oklahoma Development District¹⁰³ has a multi-faceted program funded by LEAA called Law Enforcement for the Aged. Besides research and analysis of crimes committed against the elderly, they are developing educational programs on crime prevention. Probably more unique are the educational programs they are developing for criminal justice personnel. The programs address crime prevention and how to assist elderly victims of crime. They are also developing a coordinated delivery mechanism for services to the elderly by the criminal justice system and social service agencies. Another aspect of the program is assisting the elderly crime victim to achieve maximum effectiveness when called as a witness.

For more information, contact Gene Wallace, Eastern Oklahoma Development District, 800 West Okmulgee, P.O. Box 1367, Muskogee, Okla. 74401; (918) 682-7891.

TREATMENT OF THE OFFENDER OR POTENTIAL OFFENDER

The City of St. Petersburg, Fla./Junior League of St. Petersburg, Inc.¹⁰⁴ has recently started Project: Concern. It is funded primarily by LEAA, but also receives money from the city and the Junior League. It has three goals:

1. Improved delivery of social services to blacks and the elderly;
2. Increased crime prevention activities through the training of volunteers; and
3. Impact on juvenile delinquency by addressing the problems of incorrigible truancy.

Project: Concern attempts to reduce crimes against the elderly by influencing the major perpetrators of the crimes—juveniles. Volunteers work in the school system and call the home of any child who is not in school. If it is ascertained that the child is truant, both the parents and police are notified. This system provides prompt attention

¹⁰² Other groups involved were the St. Louis Police Department, Women's Crusade Against Crime, Mayor's Council on Aging, Community Development Agency, Metro Ministry Salvation Army, Red Cross, Crime Commission, Human Development Corporation, and the St. Louis Library System.

¹⁰³ Also involved were Northeastern Oklahoma State University and Conno's State College.
¹⁰⁴ Also involved were the St. Petersburg Association to Reduce Crime, School Board, Division of Youth Services, Health and Rehabilitation Services, Circuit Court, St. Petersburg Police Department, NAAAP, and the Office of Aging.

to the problem of truancy and attempts to reach children before they commit a crime. When the police locate a child who is truant, runaway, or incorrigible (but has not committed an offense), the child is sent to Project: Concern for screening instead of juvenile hall for adjudication. This keeps a child out of the juvenile justice system while attempting to deal with the cause of the problem. Project: Concern offers tutoring, counseling, employment services, and the benefit of an ongoing, one to one relationship for the child who is neglected. While the child and/or family are working with the project, no charges are filed.

For more information, contact Art Scroggs or Phyllis Cummings, City Hall Annex, 440 2nd Ave., North, St. Petersburg, Fla. 33731; (813) 893-7274.

The Wilmington, Del., police department is operating a crime prevention program that is co-sponsored by the FBI and the Police Foundation. The program that emerged is based on the results of a study of street crimes that was conducted in Wilmington in 1975.

There are four phases in the program. The first (to reduce the large number of purse snatchings) is a campaign to educate women not to carry a purse with them on the streets unless absolutely necessary.

Another phase is the provision of escort companion services utilizing school students.

A particularly innovative phase is called Operation TIC-TOC (Truants in Class are Truants Out of Crime). The objective is to remove the potential offender from the streets. Their research established that a majority of street crimes committed against the elderly were perpetrated by school age boys, frequently during school hours. Students who are found to be truant are usually suspended from school and are therefore back on the street. The TIC-TOC program reverses this situation. Students who are truant are returned to school and remain in a special class until they have proven themselves to no longer be a truancy problem.

The fourth phase is called Operation MAJIC (Monitors Aiding Justice in Court). The purpose of this program is to unite the elderly and bring about reform in the courts. The first step is the monitoring of court cases that relate (where the elderly are victims or witnesses for the prosecution) to the elderly by older volunteers. The volunteers observe and document such things as the punctuality of the judges and witnesses, the number of delays and continuances, whether or not the arresting officer was present, how well prepared the prosecuting attorney's case appeared to be, and most important—whether or not the final judgment was fair and just from the victim's point of view. "If the monitors conclude from their observations that too often the victim is not treated fairly, and the offender not treated justly, the elderly community, as a legitimately vocal group, should make known to the appropriate sources their displeasures * * * and plan to take positive actions in order to bring changes about."¹⁰⁵

MAJIC also provides attorneys and social workers to provide legal and supportive services.

For more information contact, Capt. Stanley Friedman, Wilmington Crime Resistance Task Force, P. O. Box 1872, Wilmington, Del. 19899; (302) 658-4300 or 571-4505.

¹⁰⁵ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Wilmington, Del., Crime Resistance Task Force)," p. 9.

The Indianapolis Anti-Crime Crusade attempts to fill in the gaps in the criminal justice system—to work in areas where professionals lack time, money, or resources to adequately address a problem. Their approach is to work with government agencies and not as an independent or competing program. The crusade has over 60,000 participants. The organization is a federation of women's volunteer groups in the City of Indianapolis. There are no dues, rules, budget, government financing, or membership list. A woman does not become a member of the crusade but participates as a volunteer. The emphasis is not on the organization but on the task.

The crusade has a variety of programs (street lighting, dropouts, corrections, police, drug abuse, and vocational guidance), and although not directed specifically to the elderly, some have direct application.

The Stay-in-School Program was started when it was learned from police records that dropouts were responsible for a large number of crimes. The volunteers worked with school counselors and authorities to ascertain which students were not attending class and how best to approach them. The volunteers contact dropouts personally and try to determine why they have stopped going to class. They continue to work with each student on a one to one basis to alleviate the student's problems.

The crusade does not have a formal budget but it does incur expenses. Volunteers generate funds through bazaars, chile suppers, benefit book reviews, and speaking engagements. Costs for printing and mailing, and miscellaneous expenses are underwritten by industry, foundations, and other organizations.

The organization's pattern and methods have application in other cities. The crusade reports that similar groups have been formed in fifty major cities and 500 smaller ones.

For more information, the address is Anti-Crime Crusade, 5343 North Arlington Ave., Indianapolis, Ind. 46226.

There are community organizations that design programs that guide or shape behavior so that participants will be deterred from committing criminal offenses. These can be education, employment, recreation, counseling, or treatment programs for drug or alcohol abuse.

Keep a Child in School in Charleston, W. Va., uses volunteers to work with junior and senior high school students on a one to one basis. Besides the education assistance, volunteers try to ensure that the students have adequate clothing and school supplies.

Harlem Prep, New York, N.Y., is a street academy. It obtains its funds from contributions from industry and foundations. Its goal is to prepare high school dropouts for college. The program also encourages its students to provide services to the community.

The Double E Program in Chicago, Ill., provides education and employment for high school dropouts. Participants attend class three days a week and work three days a week. There is a real attempt to

relate the educational to the actual job experience. The businesses that are involved in the program pay regular wages and also provide counseling and other supportive services.

The Street Academy, Oklahoma City, Okla., is run by the Urban League. It tries to identify qualified school dropouts and assist them in completing their education, beginning job training, or helping them to find productive employment. Often students are recruited directly from the city streets into the program.

The Philadelphia Urban Coalition High School Academies Program in Philadelphia, Pa., has created a unique program that unites education with employment. Their program is aimed at inner city high school students who read at approximately a fifth grade level and appear to be potential dropouts. These students are often aware that the "industrial arts" classes do not provide them with marketable skills in industry. Most of these students do not read well enough to enroll in vocational schools.

The High School Academies Program creates a number of vocational training academies within the public schools. The minimum goal for a student is the development of skills for an entrance-level position in an occupation. Companies that utilize the skills that are taught, actively participate in the school program. These companies supplement the classroom training with on-the-job education and summer employment. Most important, these companies provide full-time employment for academies graduates who can pass an entry level exam. Additional incentives for companies to participate in the school program are tax deductions, which they are allowed. The three areas that are taught are electrical appliances, business, and automotive and mechanical sciences.

The academies use a number of teaching methods which may facilitate their achievement. Students who are in the academy for applied electrical science work with the actual appliances. Reading and mathematics are taught in the context of their electrical work. Work, as often as possible, is individualized—a student can learn at his own pace.

Another interesting feature is that the students establish their own rules for discipline. In this way there is less resentment between the teaching staff and the students. The program administrator reports that there are no thefts; in fact, no crimes committed in the schools, and attendance ranges between 90-95 percent. They have a dropout rate that is almost 0. The cost of the program is approximately \$350 per student per year—above the usual school costs. (This figure does not include the personnel that are loaned by the companies to the school.)

The National Alliance of Businessmen in Washington, D.C., has developed a JOB's program. They began in 1968 by finding summer jobs for disadvantaged youths throughout the nation. The goals of that program were to provide useful work experience and also money

for the students for the following school year. In 1972 they began a program (GOLD) which combines the summer employment with part-time jobs during the school year. The students receive school credit for their work period. The companies also provide orientation periods where they explain the requirements for positions at all levels of management. They carefully explain the educational preparation necessary to attain the higher job levels. The businessmen and school counselors work together with the student to determine career goals.

The Job Opportunities Council (JOC) in Riverside, Calif., is a private nonprofit employment program. The Urban Coalition initiated the program to provide jobs for those previously considered unemployable. The council is comprised of seven companies who have agreed to let the council identify, recruit, and hire disadvantaged individuals for 15 percent of their new jobs. They agree to do this until 4 percent of their staff is made up of disadvantaged workers. JOC provides the workers with the necessary training to perform on the job. JOC finances its program through on the job training payments to member employers provided by the Manpower, Development, and Training Act.

RESIDENTIAL SECURITY

The elderly, as previously stated, not only live in fear of crime, but are also, among all age groups, the most vulnerable to the affects of crime. Although crimes against the elderly are, in a sense, just a part of the total crime problem of the country, it is widely recognized that there is a distinctiveness about the elderly as crime victims. Of all persons victimized, they suffer the most. The economic impact on elderly victims is generally greater than on younger age groups. Many older people live on fixed and relatively low incomes and have little hope of recouping financial losses through later earnings. Older people generally are less able to defend themselves and escape from threatening situations because of less physical strength and stamina. The aged are also more likely to live in high crime neighborhoods as a result of diminished income. They are reluctant to leave communities, even the inner cities, where many are concentrated and where they have lived for a long period of time. In addition, the dates of receipt by mail of monthly pension and benefit checks (and hence the dates when older people are most likely to be carrying cash) are widely known. Further, many older people live alone and rely on walking and public transportation. Finally, they usually have little physical and emotional resiliency; thus physical abuse and mental anguish caused by victimization leaves a more lasting scar.¹⁰⁶

Due to their vulnerability, fear of crime, and, in many instances, actual victimization, many of the elderly have become prisoners within their own homes or apartments. In Washington, D.C. a senior citizen stated, "It makes you feel as though you are living in jail. I even call my apartment cellblock 1003."¹⁰⁷ In Los Angeles, Calif., a witness testified that many senior citizens who would like to participate in nutrition programs do not because they are afraid to leave their homes. The director of an outreach and escort program for the elderly described the following:

* * * our work has been terribly hampered by the fact that, because of the great fear of being robbed, people have erected very large fences, sometimes with barbed wire, have put bars on the windows, and also have acquired very ferocious looking dogs. This tells us something quite interesting. People are now spending money on dogs the size of German shepherds, and Doberman pinschers. Since money to feed the dog comes directly out of their meager allowance for food, this should give you some indication of the great fear of crime.

Oftentimes we are not allowed to even get inside the yard because of the dog. If we stay there long enough and the dog barks long enough, the lady or the gentleman will shout to us through the door, "What do you want?" et cetera. Oftentimes we will toss our card over the fence. Interestingly enough, this is often followed by a phone call to the office to verify the employment of the person who tossed the card, even though that person didn't even get to talk to them. Then they are invited to come back and the elderly person says, "Yes I will talk to you now that I know that you really belong to an organization and you are not just out to ease the neighborhood."¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶ From article by Carl L. Cunningham, "Residential Crime and the Elderly Victim," HUD Challenge, April 1975, p. 28.

¹⁰⁷ See "Elderly Crime Victims: Personal Accounts of Fears and Attacks," p. 113.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., pp. 16 and 17.

However, it is not just in their homes or apartments where the elderly feel unsafe. Apartment buildings, complexes, hallways, and elevators are just as dangerous, frightening, and threatening. Consider a few of the following examples:

The president of the Resident Council of one of the largest housing complexes in the District of Columbia explained:

* * * You have to be careful going through the hallways as well as the outside because we just don't have senior citizens living in that building. We have veterans of any war who have first preference over senior citizens and, of course, they are younger and like to cut up a little more. We have people there from the various mental institutions and I tell you they give us a devil of a time around there.

Then we have alcoholics * * *. Just name it, we have got it. If it is out there in the street, it is in the building, from bootleggers on to number writers, and nobody to stop them. You wonder how these people get in.¹⁰⁹

A 74-year-old man, with tears in his eyes, described how he was robbed and beaten twice in May 1976.

I have been robbed and beaten because we have no protection. They come in and out whenever they choose * * *.

* * * I got off the elevator, they hit me and knocked me down. I did not have much money but they took all my credentials."¹¹⁰

The president of the Tolbert House Council Residents of Washington, D.C., stated that what is really needed in "national capital housing" is better security. The security guards are untrained and underpaid. They usually are students who study on the job and are not concerned nor understanding of the special needs of the elderly.¹¹¹

A 70-year-old resident of the Yerba Buena Annex in San Francisco, Calif., has been mugged eight times. A few of those incidents occurred in the building. His residence has also been burglarized three times. Thus, this individual has learned to take a few precautions. Just recently, upon returning to his apartment he heard a burglar rummaging around inside. The elderly man told the burglar to come out or he would go after him with his peashooter (.38 caliber revolver). The intruder darted out from behind a cupboard, knocked the victim down with a couple of kicks in the spine and threatened to kill him. The elderly man managed to get his gun from his pocket and shoot the intruder in the leg. The burglar staggered from the apartment and spent the night with his girl friend 70 feet down the corridor.¹¹²

What if homes, apartments, and complexes were made safe, but their surrounding neighborhoods remained hazardous? The neighborhood that they live in often presents a great danger. That many of the elderly have stopped going to church is an expression of the fear they experience. Delegate Walter E. Fauntroy, who has been a minister of a church for 18 years testified before the subcommittee:

Going to church becomes a major undertaking. The elderly fear going alone, and they certainly cease to attend the midweek services. This is more a tragedy than it would seem. In the first place, the church is very often the only source of comfort that an elderly person has remaining in his or her life. The midweek services are often coupled with a meal that is an important staple in the diet and nutrition planning of the elderly. For them to miss out on these services, which are not costing any government money, is a psychological cost to them and a monetary cost to the Government which must now provide these services.¹¹³

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 113.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 108.

¹¹¹ Ibid., pp. 106 and 107.

¹¹² From article by Marshall Kliduff, "Fear in the Pink Palace," San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 10, 1977.

¹¹³ See "Elderly Crime Victims: Personal Accounts of Fears and Attacks," p. 98.

Another witness stated:

I myself was held up a year ago. This was May 20. It was 7:30. It happened in our neighborhood, when I was leaving the temple. It was still daylight. I was with another friend. We were jumped from the back at the point of a knife. I had my purse and the purse was jerked out of my fingers. My fingers were broken. Of course, you cannot live with it [fear] all the time. * * *¹¹⁴

The fear of attack on the streets is tremendous among the elderly. This is understandable since many have been victimized on their way to the grocery store, to cash their checks, or to see their doctors. This fear, however, is different from the fear of attack in one's home. Hardware, backup lighting, etc., presumably prevent attack in one's home or apartment, thus somewhat reducing the mental tension. This kind of control is not possible on the streets. Therefore, it is important that not only streets, but whole neighborhoods, be made safe for all people, especially for the elderly.

In exploring ways to reduce crime, the total environment must be examined. If meaningful security is to be provided, both physical and social issues must be addressed. Security planning should be as comprehensive as possible in its purpose and in the measures used.

* * * It is not enough to view security improvements in purely hardware or personnel terms such as a locked door, or a brightly lighted yard, or additional guards. The provision of adequate measures of security leads to a state of individual well-being and of community health. In the fullest sense of the term, security flows from the strength and cohesiveness of the community. It arises from people having confidence in their neighbors and their neighborhood.¹¹⁵

Since the home is considered a sanctuary, its violation "can leave lasting feelings of being invaded, of threat to one's life, of aloneness and anonymity that irreparably demeans the elderly person's life * * *"¹¹⁶ Emphasis, therefore, needs to be focused on protection of the home since burglary is the predominant crime against the elderly. Studies have shown that residential burglaries are often forcible entry of a single-family house or duplex that was unoccupied at the time of the crime. Entry usually is gained through front or back doors by breaking a glass and slipping the lock, or by breaking a corner windowpane. In at least half of the cases, the site of the entry was clearly visible from the street. What is more significant, however, is the fact that at least 50 percent of the crimes were committed during daylight.¹¹⁷

Two important implications can be drawn from the data: First, burglaries of elderly residences, contrary to popular belief, focus on single-family homes and duplexes and not on apartments and public housing developments. Second, offenders show a high disregard for the possibility of being seen and reported to the police by neighbors.

Immediate action is needed to alleviate the present vulnerability of the elderly to burglary. The physical security of residences, especially in high crime areas, needs to be improved. Crime resistance planning, i.e., the defensible space concept, in new construction should be utilized.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 14 and 15.

¹¹⁵ See "Elderly Crime Victimization (Residential Security)," p. 4.

¹¹⁶ From article by Carl L. Cunningham, "Residential Crime and the Elderly Victim," 1975, p. 29.

¹¹⁷ From article by Carl L. Cunningham, "Crime and the Aging Victim," Midwest Research Institute Quarterly, Spring 1973, p. 7.

¹¹⁸ Few of the programs, techniques, devices, or recommendations discussed in this report would have universal application. Each community must carefully plan and rate their effectiveness and select those best suited for it.

SECURING THE HOME

This chapter will first focus on reducing victimization in both multifamily and private residential dwellings that are already constructed.

Over 65 percent of the elderly own their own homes. Most of them are 30 to 40 years old and physically deteriorating due to the owner's limited financial resources. Thus, most are in need of the hardware that has traditionally been used to prevent illegal entry into homes.

At least minimum protection standards need to be met. Exterior doors, other than sliding doors, should be equipped with a dead bolt or a self-locking deadlatch. The self-locking deadlatch provides only minimal protection, therefore, it should be used in conjunction with a dead bolt. The dead bolt and the latch should be key operated from the outside and operated from the inside by a device not requiring a key. For good security, secondary locks are essential. The three major types of secondary locks are: spring bolt, horizontal dead bolt, and vertical deadlock. Even though the horizontal deadlocks provide better protection than spring bolts, they can be easily overcome. Thus whenever possible, the vertical bolt deadlock should be used as a secondary lock. For excellent security, a pick-resistant cylinder should be installed in a vertical dead bolt body.

If the dwelling has weak door frames, as is usually the case in older buildings, a buttress-type lock is advisable. The strength of a door can also be increased by using the double-bar lock.

Doors should be able to withstand efforts to force entry by brute strength, and they should retain the attached locking devices securely. For ordinary residential use, steel-clad doors provide good security. Wood doors, while less strong than steel-clad doors, are secure. They should be of solid core construction with a minimum thickness of 1 3/4 inches. Hollow-core wood doors and thin-wood panel doors are not acceptable where security is a factor.

Wooden door frames, to be secure, should be at least two inches thick. Metal-covered wood frames, when used with metal covered wood doors, provide an optimum cost-security investment. If a hollow steel frame is used, the residual air space behind the frame should be filled with crush-resistant material to prevent an intruder from wedging a crowbar between the door and frame to crush the frame to free the lock. All plates located on the outsides of doors should be attached with tamper-resistant connectors such as round-headed carriage bolts or one-way screws.

Door hinges should be mounted on the inside so that burglars cannot remove the door from the hinges to enter. Hinges should have nonremovable pins, if they must be placed on the outside. Pins can be made nonremovable by peening the straight end or by drilling and topping a machine screw into the middle portion of each pin from the inside of the open hinge. Outside hinges can be protected by screwing two screws halfway into the jamb edge of the door. One screw is placed near each hinge, and a receiving hole is drilled into the jamb for each screw. Even if the hinge pins are removed, the protruding screws will hold the door when it is closed.

Whenever possible, optical interviewers (peepholes) should be installed on doors that provide entry into the home. Interviewers with openings of over one-quarter of an inch are not recommended because the larger ones can easily be punched out to allow insertion of tools to open the door from the inside. In addition, a knife, gun, or wire can be stuck through the hole while the resident is looking through it. Wide-angle glass should be used, otherwise the person outside cannot be seen unless the individual is standing in a direct line with the interviewer. A case hardened steel chain which fits into a horizontally mounted slide track on one end of the door jamb may be installed in place of an optical interviewer. The chain should allow the door to open no more than two inches to permit easy conversation without fully unlocking the door. These chains should be used for interviewing only and not to protect a locked door. It should be remembered that steel chains and slides, even when equipped with a locking mechanism, are readily overcome by simple tools and brute force.

Sliding doors on the ground level or accessible by a balcony should be constructed so that the movable section of the door slides on the inside of the fixed part. They should be of break-resistant glass and equipped with a vertical bolt lock which uses a hood type bolt to grip the door and frame together.

Windows that open onto stairways, porches, platforms, or other areas affording easy access into the home should be equipped with some type of locking device. Minimum security can be provided with a crescent sash lock, thumb screw latch, steel pin-in-the-hole device, or a slide bolt latch. These devices can easily be overcome by breaking a small section of the glass. Adequate security for normal residential use can be provided with key operated window locks. A set of keys should be kept close to the window in case of emergencies but out of reach of a burglar. For tighter security, metal bars, grilles, and gates can be used. Precautions, however, should be taken to provide for emergency exits. The metal of a wire mesh grille should be at least one-eighth of an inch in diameter and the openings should not exceed two inches. The grille should be attached to the window frame with machine or roundhead bolts which cannot be removed from the outside.

When bars are used, they should not be placed more than five inches apart. The diameter of the bars should be at least three quarters of an inch and be set at least three inches into the masonry.

Sliding gates afford excellent protection and can be opened easily for emergency exit. The gates should be set in tracks on the top and bottom to prevent them from being pulled or pried away from the window. Bars, grilles, and gates should be installed inside the window for maximum security.¹¹⁰

All the security hardware described above can be used in both multifamily and private residential dwellings to improve the security of the home. Additional steps can be taken by each type of residence to make the home safer. Each will be individually discussed below.

The grounds of a single-family dwelling or duplex can easily be defined through the use of fences, low walls, or foliage. These can act as psychological barriers and keep some intruders out. The borders, however, should not provide a hiding place for intruders. Large trees

¹¹⁰ This information was gathered from various HUD publications.

and shrubs should not obstruct the views of doors and windows from the street and neighbors.

Outside lights should be used to illuminate points of entry. The front of the house should have two overhead lights—one above the driveway and the other above the front door. Lights should never be placed so that shadows will be cast over door and window areas.

The security problems of the elderly are compounded in apartment buildings and complexes. The hallways, elevators, and lobbies present new areas of vulnerability. The crime problem is most acute in Federally-assisted housing projects. This study will focus on Federally-assisted housing; however, it should be understood that many of the concepts can be utilized in all apartment buildings and complexes.

Security can be provided in residential complexes by using four fundamental approaches:

1. Creation of a fortification with limited and controlled access points,
2. Subdivision of a large residential complex into smaller components, so that each can be controlled naturally by a small number of residents,
3. Relocation of a particularly crime-prone group into a safe area occupied by that group alone, and
4. Inundation of a residential complex by security personnel.¹²⁰

The first step in creating a fortification in a complex is the hardening of the individual apartments as previously discussed. The creation of a fortification with limited and controlled access points for the complex will not, however, work in all situations. For instance, in many of the Federally-assisted housing projects, the criminals are residents of the project or they have friends in the complex and are frequent visitors. Thus, a door attendant to screen people entering the complex would be almost useless.¹²¹

An intercom system is another method of limiting and controlling access. The system works best in buildings with 50 families or less sharing an entry, and it is most efficient in elderly complexes that contain 150 units. During peak periods in the morning and evening, the traffic is so heavy that it produces virtually an open building. In addition, many elderly reside in complexes with families which have teenage children. Teenagers, frustrated by closed doors and absent parents, can, and many times do, break through the locking hardware. Children can be disciplined to obey rules, but a parent must be home much of the time to be able to respond to children through the intercom. It is not practical to develop a security system that depends on unavailable resources or on behavior which is not characteristic to a resident group or to the management.¹²²

DEFENSIBLE SPACE

The subdivision of a large residential complex into smaller components for natural control by a small number of residents is advisable. This is the "defensible space" concept, which can be defined as:

* * * a model for residential environments which inhibits crime by creating the physical expression of a social fabric that defends itself. All the different elements

¹²⁰ From article by Oscar Newman, "Defensible Space," HUD Challenge, September 1973, p. 7.

¹²¹ See "Defensible Space," pp. 7 and 8.

¹²² Ibid.

which combine to make a defensible space have a common goal—an environment in which latent territoriality and sense of community in the inhabitants can be translated into responsibility for ensuring a safe, productive, and well-maintained living space. The potential criminal perceives such a space as controlled by its residents, leaving him an intruder easily recognized and dealt with.

It has also been defined as:

* * * a surrogate term for the range of mechanisms—real and symbolic barriers, strongly defined areas of influence, and improved opportunities for surveillance—that combine to bring an environment under the control of its residents. A 'defensible space' is a living enhancement of their lives, while providing security for their families, neighbors, and friends.¹²³

The concept of "defensible space" is a sociophysical phenomenon which will not become a reality, however, unless the inhabitants of the complex assume the responsibility of ensuring their own security to create and preserve a safe living environment.

The public areas of multi-family complexes without "defensible space" can make walking from street to apartment a dangerous challenge. The fear and uncertainty of living in such an environment eventually destroys the security and sanctity of each apartment unit.¹²⁴ This problem can be alleviated by facilitating " * * * residents' adoption of territorial attitudes and policing measures, which, in the end, are the strongest deterrents to criminal and vandal activity."¹²⁵ This can be accomplished by:

* * * designing housing developments in which dwelling units are grouped together to facilitate associations of mutual benefit; by delineating areas for particular functions; by clearly delineating paths of movement; by defining outdoor areas of activity for particular users through their juxtaposition with interior living areas; and by providing inhabitants with natural opportunities for the continued visual surveillance of these public areas, in buildings and outside them.¹²⁶

Acceptable behavior around the home begins to be defined when residents are able to understand that an area is within their sphere of concern and control and that they have the right to monitor behavior. By using the proper physical design, a situation can be created " * * * in which both inhabitant and stranger can perceive that a particular area is under the undisputed sphere of influence of a specific group of inhabitants."¹²⁷ This influence can be made so evident that residents become confident and begin questioning the actions of those not recognized. In turn, potential intruders are made to feel that their presence will be questioned and challenged, thus deterring them from entering into defined areas.

"Defensible space" can be developed by degrees from area to area and can be extended from the apartment unit to the street. Mr. Newman further states that "defensible space":

* * * design techniques are as applicable to low-density garden apartments and row-house developments as they are to projects composed of high-rise apartment buildings. The common corridor shared by a small cluster of apartments on each floor of a multistory building is the first communal area beyond the apartment unit into which occupants can be made to extend the realm of their homes and the zone of felt responsibility. The second area is the common entry and circulation paths within their buildings. The third area can be created through the clustering of buildings to define a project's grounds and its entry. The final level in the hierarchy can be created at the interface where the housing development stakes its claim on the surrounding urban streets and community facilities.¹²⁸

¹²³ Oscar Newman, "Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design," 1973, pp. 3 and 4.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*

¹²⁵ Oscar Newman, "Design Guidelines for Creating Defensible Space," 1975, p. 4.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 4 and 5.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

It is important to note, however, that the concepts of "defensible space" become virtually impossible to implement within a residential environment that is already in existence. The kind of building modifications necessary to provide "defensible space" would be extensive and the cost of such modifications prohibitive. The subdivision of a residential complex into naturally controlled and surveyed sectors is more feasible when one is able to incorporate the designs into new construction.

Thus, there are several features of building design that must be considered in order to provide "defensible space" and this becomes of extreme importance when one considers the special security needs of the elderly.

It is desirable that the selection of a building type be suited to the lifestyles and needs of its future occupants. When considering elderly residents, it must be taken into account that most of them will be retired and therefore spending a large portion of their time around the complex. Thus, the building should be designed to facilitate resident gatherings, particularly in areas such as the lobbies, main corridors, mail room, and lounges. The elderly would also benefit from buildings that have outside areas specifically designed for their needs.

The reassigning of populations is another mechanism for providing security to residents. This means housing the elderly in buildings or projects separate from those provided for family occupancy. There is a question of whether a policy of separation is desirable. Many gerontologists believe that age-integrated neighborhoods are better for the elderly, because they assume that diverse age groups will develop the needed social interaction and mutual support. On the other hand, many social scientists and criminal justice experts feel that crime against the elderly can be reduced or eliminated if buildings are designed and reserved solely for the elderly.¹²⁹ This study, however, will not examine all the social implications of the aforementioned theories.

An experiment conducted at Southwark Plaza in Philadelphia showed that housing older people in buildings restricted exclusively for the elderly does, in fact, reduce victimization. Southwark Plaza was originally designed to facilitate intergenerational living.¹³⁰ Access to elevators could be obtained from the sidewalk, as the idea of a main lobby was never incorporated into the building design. This allowed free access to anyone desiring entry, both residents and non-residents alike. The elevators were also extremely dangerous areas and were frequently out of order due to the vandalism of children. The corridors themselves were narrow, dimly lit and had many corners which afforded concealment to criminal elements. Finally, although an inner courtyard with benches was provided, the elderly residents were unable to use it without being pelted with objects thrown by children from apartment units overlooking the area.

Then, a self-advocacy group known as the Action Alliance for Senior Citizens initiated the Alliance Safety Committee, formed to study the security problems experienced by elderly residents of the Philadelphia area, specifically those of the residents of Southwark

¹²⁹ From article by Edmund Sherman, Evelyn Newman, and Anne Nelson, "Living Arrangements and Security Among the Elderly: A Study," HUD Challenge, June 1976, p. 13.

¹³⁰ From article by Powell Lawton, "The Drama of Southwark Plaza," HUD Challenge, May 1975, p. 11.

Plaza.¹³¹ Together with the assistance of the Philadelphia Housing Authority and the City Department of Health, the Action Alliance drew up a program of recommended changes to improve the existing conditions of the complex for its residents.

It was determined that age integration was a large portion of the security problem and a decision was made to gradually phase out young families and renting the vacant units to elderly families. Entrances to the building were enclosed, preventing street access to elevators and mail-boxes. Building security was improved by providing 24-hour coverage, utilizing two guards per shift, who had telephone access to all residents for the purpose of security checks on visitors.

In addition a small minibus was provided for the transportation of residents to senior centers and other points about town, such as the bank, supermarket, and nearby hospital. On other occasions, group walking trips were organized for the residents.

The above-listed measures vastly improved the quality of life for the elderly residents at Southwark Plaza, and this was done at a relatively low cost. These improvements have not been as effective due to unforeseen problems which are in the process of being corrected. For example, the security guards are not always on duty simultaneously and, because their pay is extremely low, are occasionally careless concerning access to the building. Some of the elderly residents do not take advantage of the transportation provided by the minibuses, thus exposing themselves to the risks of street crime.

Despite these problems, however, the Southwark Plaza complex has become a model for similar projects in Philadelphia and other areas could benefit from these types of improvements.

A study conducted by the Institute of Gerontology of the State University of New York tends to support the thesis that age-segregation reduces crime against the elderly. The Institute conducted a survey among elderly residents of three " * * different types of public housing in the Albany-Troy area to determine the effects of different living arrangements on the numbers and kinds of crimes involving elderly victims."¹³²

Two projects, John Boyd Thacker Homes and Lincoln Park Homes, in Albany, N.Y., represented an age-integrated housing pattern. In these projects, the elderly live side by side with families of different ages. Kennedy Towers, a single high-rise building in Troy, was selected as the site for studying the age-segregated pattern. Finally, Ida Yarbrough Homes in Albany represented the mixed housing arrangement. This housing project consisted of two high-rise buildings for the elderly located among low-rise buildings, housing younger adults and their families.

Conducted were 169 interviews: 64 in age-integrated housing, 55 in age-segregated housing, and 50 from the mixed arrangement. The survey revealed that the age-integrated housing had the most victimization. Twenty-five of the 64 respondents in age-integrated housing had been victimized as follows: four had been robbed, five were victims of purse snatching, two of assault, five had been victims of vandalism and harassment and one reported a crime but refused to elaborate.¹³³

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² See "Living Arrangements and Security Among the Elderly: A Study," p. 12.

¹³³ Ibid.

There were seven victims in the mixed setting: two had been robbed, two were victims of purse snatching, and three of burglary. The age-segregated housing had eight victims: five had their purses snatched, one was assaulted, and two were victims of unclassified offenses. It is important to note that in the age-integrated housing, the majority of the crimes occurred in the building: 11 inside the apartments, five in the elevators, and five elsewhere in the building. On the other hand, only two crimes occurred in the apartments of the age-segregated complex. The others occurred as follows: four on the grounds of the project, one on the neighborhood streets and one elsewhere. In addition, the survey showed that "three residents in the age-integrated and two in the age-segregated setting were victims of a crime more than once while living in their respective projects."¹³⁴ Further, a higher percentage of the residents in the age-integrated housing knew of other inhabitants of their complexes who had been victimized than was true in the other two types of housing.¹³⁵

Two other interesting findings resulted from the study. The fear of crime in the neighborhood was higher in the age-segregated complex than it was in the other two projects. Despite their fear of crime, none of the residents of either the mixed setting or the age-segregated project, indicated that they wanted to move. However, 42 percent of those interviewed in the age-integrated setting wanted to move.

It is evident that victimization and fear of crime are higher in age-integrated buildings. It should be noted that mixed housing in essence is age-segregated by building. Therefore, it can be concluded that age-segregated housing for the elderly reduces both the incidence and fear of crime. "Residents of age-segregated buildings feel more secure in the buildings even while feeling anxious in the neighborhood."¹³⁶ In future planning for elderly-assisted housing, priority should be given to age-segregated projects. If age-segregated projects are not feasible, certain buildings should be reserved for the aged within projects.

NEIGHBORHOOD RECLAMATION

Even if apartments and complexes are secured, what about the neighborhood in which the elderly reside? The neighborhood must be made safe since the elderly have to go to and from their buildings to carry out necessary tasks. Two approaches to securing neighborhoods have been developed and can be used to complement each other.

"Turf Reclamation" is the approach to making a neighborhood safe by developing a sense of community in order to control the activities and actions of individuals in the surrounding territory.¹³⁷ The other approach, referred to as the "territoriality concept," attempts to integrate the resident's feelings of the neighborhood with the problems created by the physical environment.¹³⁸ Both approaches are similar in that they are concerned with the establishment of neighborhood values. However, the latter related the social values to the physical characteristics of a neighborhood as well as to the crime rate.

¹³⁴ Ibid., p. 13.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ From article by Seymour J. Rosenthal, "Turf Reclamation. An Approach to Neighborhood Security," HUD Challenge, March, 1974, p. 1.

¹³⁸ From article by Richard A. Gardner, "Crime and the Neighborhood Environment," HUD Challenge, February, 1976, p. 9.

In order to reclaim and control the turf in a neighborhood, values must be established. Many times, however, the value standards of behavior are being set by adults through their silence and inaction. This is due to fear; people are afraid of retaliation or that their friendship with neighbors will be disrupted because they are informing on their neighbors' children. The only way to reduce or eliminate the fear of taking action is to act in concert with friends and neighbors, i.e., turf is reclaimed through the removal of isolation. The process of turf reclamation begins with neighbors sharing concerns with each other. Usually these people hold the same feelings but have been reluctant to express them.¹³⁹

Once community values have been developed, action needs to be taken to set standards for the neighborhood. This is an extremely difficult task since the question becomes whose values are being imposed on the community. Dialog needs to be initiated between neighbors to discuss the kind of values they hold and to determine how to respond when certain problems occur. There will be many difficulties but people can begin by identifying those things which obviously are not permissible. For example, it is wrong to break street lights, harass the elderly because they have different lifestyles, break car windows with air rifles or litter with empty beer cans or broken bottles.

Community alternatives need to be developed because one cannot "take something without giving something."¹⁴⁰ For instance, if children that hang around neighborhood corners or public parks to harass the elderly are to be remotivated, then the community must develop alternatives. The alternatives could be jobs or recreation programs. The problem, unfortunately, is that there are too few alternatives.

Security in public housing must come from within. The tenants must develop the sense that they are dependent upon each other and develop values and standards internally. However, security in public housing cannot be provided without providing social services.¹⁴¹

The territoriality concept asserts "that there is an important link between the physical characteristics of the environment and the crime rate in residential areas."¹⁴² While there are many factors involved in whether a situation provides an opportunity for crime, the physical environment plays a prominent role in the occurrence of some types of crime, especially burglary, robbery and stranger-to-stranger assault.

Gardiner Associates of Cambridge, Mass., has developed a multifaceted planning design process "which (1) identifies physical environmental conflicts that facilitate crime offenses and (2) develops strategies and designs for dealing with those conflicts in each particular setting."¹⁴³ American cities have different urban environments and problems, therefore, a uniform strategy would not be applicable to all settings. The process of identifying problems and possible solutions, however, is applicable over a broad range of urban conditions.

The urban planning and design process analyzes the physical environment to understand how each component functions and relates to the total physical fabric to identify the environmental conflicts that

¹³⁹ See "Turf Reclamation: An Approach to Neighborhood Security," p. 2.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴² See "Crime and the Neighborhood Environment," p. 9.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

contribute to crime and fear. Other information gathered through a variety of sources (such as police crime reports, interviews with offenders to determine behavior patterns, victimization and attitude surveys to obtain actual victimization rates, and the degree of fear and attitude toward the police) assists in identifying some of the crime related problems in a particular neighborhood.¹⁴⁴

The information coupled with common environmental configurations developed by Gardiner Associates, Inc. helps to begin describing "a neighborhood that has a probability of being relatively free of crime and fear, even if located in a high-crime area." A few of the configurations are discussed below:

1. Where the "urban support systems" (circulation, public facility location, open space zoning, parking, etc.) are not supportive of the dominant land use in an area, there is greater potential for crimes of opportunity and for fear. For example, if residential streets in the interior of a neighborhood carry a great deal of heavy traffic, then the semi-private residential character of the neighborhood is undermined. The residents can no longer exercise effective control over their environment and assure their own security, primarily because they cannot differentiate between neighbor and stranger.

2. The presence of open parking lots, vacant lots, and open block interiors both helps the offender and contributes to the residents' fear of their immediate surroundings. This so-called "porosity" offers the offender easy covert access to victims or burglary targets and a multiplicity of unobserved escape routes, while undermining the residents' sense of being able to observe, predict and control what happens around their homes.

3. The presence of certain types of facilities in residential areas can be "crime or opportunity generators," either by attracting potential offenders or victims. For example, a hospital in a residential district would attract both patients and staff to the neighborhood streets, which could also be used by youths (some of them offenders) on their way to or from a nearby high school. Thus, the location of these two "generators" causes the paths of potential victims and offenders to cross, creating an opportunity for crime and a reason for fear.

4. When the traditional "focal point" of a community is "taken over" by outsiders or unruly youths, the potential for crime, and particularly fear, is enhanced. Often the focal point of a community or neighborhood (be it a park, playground, school, small shopping area, or landmark) serves a variety of functions from which it derives its significance: as a community facility, as a gathering point for informal interaction, as an amenity and as a symbolic statement of the community's identity. When use and control of this focal point is dominated by outsiders, the role of that place changes markedly. Where a park was once the center of community life, serving as a gathering place for informal social interaction, it can become a feared and avoided intrusion into the community, used by teenage gangs as a hangout and a place from which to "scope out" potential victims.

5. Clearly defined and easily understood boundaries between districts or neighborhoods tend to reduce their vulnerability to crime. They enhance residents' identification with the area within which they are "at home," and inform outsiders when they cross the threshold into an area that "belongs" to other people. Examples of typical successful boundaries are water bodies, transportation corridors, large parks or cemeteries, and dramatic topography changes.

6. The transition zone between two areas of different type or intensity of use is very significant with regard to security. If transitional areas are clearly marked by hedges, fences, changes in pavement, circuitous paths and changes in building scales, security will be enhanced.¹⁴⁵

In order to work, "urban support systems" must have some minimum grain of residential fabric. This is usually missing in heterogeneous neighborhoods, making it difficult to employ the territoriality concept in reducing crime. However, it is not an impossible task to accomplish.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 10 and 11.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

Strong efforts must be made to employ the territoriality concept in mixed neighborhoods. Regardless of the type of neighborhood involved, if this concept is to be effective, the three following conditions must be developed:

1. Residents must be made to feel a proprietary interest and responsibility over areas beyond their own front doors, a responsibility which must be shared with their neighbors;
2. Residents must be able to perceive when this "territory" is potentially threatened (i.e., can discriminate between neighbors and strangers) and must be willing to act on that perception; and
3. Potential offenders must be able to perceive that they are intruding on other people's domain and are likely to be deterred from criminal behavior.

Territorial control in residential areas should be a goal in reducing the opportunity for crime and the fear of crime. The research and demonstration efforts that have been initiated to document how the configuration of the physical environment influences both the degree of opportunity for crime and the potential for effective territorial control by residents should be expanded and continued. The findings from further research in this area will refine the understanding of the problems making the concept more readily applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Congress should enact legislation that would provide assistance to states which operate programs to compensate victims of crime.

This legislation would have a twofold purpose:

It would provide grants to states that have a crime victim compensation program; and

It would also provide an incentive to states that do not have such programs to implement victim compensation programs.

H.R. 3686, Victims of Crime Act of 1977, would be the appropriate bill, however, it does not consider the unique problems encountered by elderly victims of crime. The subcommittee, therefore, recommends that a victim compensation bill recognize the special needs of the elderly by incorporating the following provisions:

1. That victims 62 years of age or older, with annual taxable incomes of \$3280 or less for an individual and \$6076 or less for a couple, be compensated for property loss. Annual taxable income for the purposes of this recommendation is defined by section 63 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. These income amounts are determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and are the intermediate level of the retired couple's budget. Therefore, these income figures would automatically change each year. Only property which is essential for the well-being and security of the individual would be eligible for compensation. There should be no minimum for compensation, however, a maximum of \$1000 should be established. In order to minimize administrative costs, a simplified process is recommended for losses under \$100.00.
2. That medical expenses for a victim 62 or older not covered by medicare or medicaid should be compensated.

3. That emergency assistance for such items as food, medicine, rent, utilities, and other essentials be provided for the elderly crime victim. The cost of this assistance would be recovered from any compensation that the victim would receive.

4. That the victim, particularly the elderly, be notified by the police officers investigating the crime of the victim compensation program. The police agency should be required to furnish application forms and to provide assistance to the victim in completing the forms. This could easily be accomplished by the establishment of a "victim advocate" by police departments.

5. The existence of the victim compensation program must be widely publicized. Hospitals licensed under state or federal laws or using federal assistance should be required to prominently display in their emergency rooms posters containing detailed information on the existence and provisions of the program. Posters emphasizing the special provisions for assistance to the elderly should be displayed at social security offices, senior centers, nutrition sites, and senior citizen housing projects.

H.R. 3686 has created an effective mechanism to establish a victim compensation program. An analysis of this bill by the subcommittee determined that it would *not* provide assistance to the most seriously debilitated victims of crime—the elderly.

This bill has very broad guidelines so that a variety of state plans can qualify for federal reimbursement. A majority of these state plans, however, have provisions that are discriminatory (albeit not purposefully) to the elderly. In a study of victim compensation programs in 1976, all states that responded (11) revealed that their victim compensation program only covered those people who were victims of violent crimes that resulted in personal injury or death. Data from another survey of 17 states revealed that 13 of them require a minimum loss be sustained before an award can be given—usually \$100 or 2 weeks' earnings.

Although the elderly appear to be victims of violent crimes to a lesser degree than the general population, this report clearly shows that they are frequently the victims of property crimes—burglary, robbery, and larceny with contact. These older victims who are most frequently on fixed incomes (43.8 percent of elderly couples are at or below the poverty level) with little or no savings, are virtually unable to recoup monetary losses. They also do not have the resources to replace stolen items or repair damaged property. Even the loss of \$20.00, an amount of money that does not register on the FBI Crime Index, can represent a much greater relative loss to the older person on a small, fixed income. This amount of money can deny food, or essential drugs, or cause a utility bill to go unpaid. For these reasons, it is necessary to include a section in a victim compensation bill that will alleviate the distresses of property loss and damage to the needy elderly victim. Therefore, the Subcommittee proposes that persons 62 years of age or older with taxable incomes of \$3280 a year or less (\$6076 for a couple) be compensated for the loss of essential property up to a maximum of \$1000. This compensation cannot be counted as income under any public assistance program. Only property which is necessary to the well-being and security of the individual will be eligible for reimbursement.

Examples of essential items are to include but not be limited to stoves; refrigerators; health support equipment and prosthetic devices; and radios and televisions.

Radios and televisions are being included as essential items due to the reduced mobility experienced by many elderly people. These items of communication and entertainment are often the older person's only means of recreation and communication with the outside world. Included as essential items would also be costs to the victim for property damage as the result of a burglary, e.g., the costs to replace a broken door or window, and the expense accrued in changing locks and replacing keys. It is suggested that no minimum loss be established as a requirement for assistance due to the relative and absolute poverty of many of the elderly crime victims.

With regard to medical costs and property losses, the bill clearly states that all insurances are to be utilized before reimbursement under this bill. (The deductible under medicare, if it has not been paid, would be paid under this bill.)

Research conducted by the subcommittee indicates a need for emergency funds for the elderly crime victim. Of the 11 states surveyed, 5 indicated that they already provide emergency awards. The need for emergency funds is predicated on the limited income and minimal resources available to almost half of the elderly population. If the funds from a recently-cashed social security check are stolen, as is often the case, elderly people would not have the means of paying rent or buying food until their next month's check arrived.

The subcommittee also recommends the use of a "victim advocate" to assist the elderly in completing the required forms and provide the necessary linkages to community services. Many older persons need assistance as the result of victimization, e.g., transportation to the doctor, assistance in replacing stolen property, and transportation to court if the offender is brought to trial. The literature on victim compensation indicates that most of the eligible persons under existing programs are not completing the process of filing for compensation. The responsibility of completing the forms after a traumatic event may be unrealistic, especially for an older person. A victim advocate would be a vital and necessary aspect of the program.

The subcommittee also believes that the states must be responsible for the dissemination of information about this program. Persons must not be disenfranchised because the information was not made available to them. If police are required by law to read suspects their constitutional rights, they should be equally responsible to inform the victims of their rights.

The subcommittee suggests reimbursement of the elderly victimization sections at a 75/25 ratio. It is believed that this added incentive would encourage the states to enact this more explicated but very necessary legislation.

2. Congress should enact legislation to create a Central Office of Criminal Justice Statistics within the Department of Justice.

This office would be responsible for compiling and analyzing all data regarding crime nationally, including that gathered by the FBI and LEAA. In addition, this office should require the FBI to record, through the Uniform Crime Report, the age of all crime victims. Further, all other Federal agencies, such as HUD, which also gather data and conduct research on crime should submit their statistics to the Central Office of Criminal Justice Statistics to be included as part of the National Criminal Justice Statistics System. Finally, a Memorandum of Agreement should be drawn between the Department of Justice and all other Federal agencies that gather information on crime to outline the methodology for compiling and analyzing data and to provide for efficient coordination and cooperation between agencies.

The subcommittee believes that a major stumbling block in the writing of this report and in the development of viable programs to reduce elderly victimization was the lack of available and uniform data. For this reason, it is recommended that a Central Office of Statistics be created. There is also concern that the FBI does not require local police departments to record the age of the victim for the Uniform Crime Report. The survey conducted by the subcommittee shows that a number of police departments are already collecting this data. The subcommittee feels that this will not create any

appreciable expense for the Department and would be very beneficial to the further study of the relationship of crime to age.

3. *Congress should mandate that the Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency of the National Institute on Mental Health in conjunction with the National Institute on Aging conduct an in-depth study of crimes against the elderly by juveniles. The study should specifically focus on the reasons for the increase in violence and brutality.*

A number of studies cited in the report and witnesses that testified before the subcommittee noted an increase in the amount of injury and brutality inflicted on the elderly victim of crime by juveniles. This is particularly noteworthy because the elderly victim rarely puts up any type of resistance. It appears that no research to date adequately explains this violent behavior. If preventive measures are to be developed, there must be information on the causes of the teenagers violent conduct.

4. *Congress should amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide for a National Conference on Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency.*

The subcommittee found that the majority of crime perpetrated against the elderly is youth-related. The subcommittee believes the best hope for reducing crime against the elderly is to reduce juvenile delinquency and youth crime.

Although LEAA has made tremendous contributions toward the suppression and punishment of crime in this country, an insufficient emphasis has been focused on the preventive aspects of juvenile crime. Juvenile crime prevention should be visualized as the number one national priority, and Congress should direct its attention to innovative proposals designed to head off the juvenile crime problem by attacking it in the schools where all young people go and where many of the problems develop.

Therefore, the subcommittee recommends that the proposal embodied in H.R. 1137, the National Conference on Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency Act, be enacted in order that Congress might renew its commitment to prevent delinquency, acknowledge the need to stop ignoring a vulnerable and potentially delinquent population, and make a positive step forward in reducing crime against the elderly.

The National Institute of Mental Health has established that a learning disability is the greatest single reason children drop out of school—700,000 each year—and 75 percent of these children find themselves in juvenile detention centers. Youth with learning disabilities are at greater risk with respect to law and custom than those not similarly handicapped.

In so many cases learning disabilities go undetected simply because the symptoms are so subtle and few people understand that the problem exists. The frustration from the inability to learn and continuous academic failure is a heavy burden for a child to bear. It is understandable that the unidentified learning-disabled youth will exhibit restlessness in classroom situations, suffer from boredom, and eventually drop out of school. It is equally understandable that this same youth will act out his frustration in delinquent ways.

If the learning-disabled youth enters the law enforcement or judicial process, a host of additional problems come into being. The policeman, the probation officer, and the judge, who have not had special training in this area, cannot recognize the subtle symptoms of the disability. As a consequence, the learning-disabled offenders continue to be more handicapped by our society's ignorance of their problems than by the learning disability itself.

The subcommittee believes that if efforts toward preventing delinquency and other negative effects of learning disabilities are to be successful, it is paramount that all facets of the community with whom the learning disabled interact be sensitized to the existence and symptoms of their problem. This shared knowledge should be incorporated into the curriculum for teachers, social workers, probation officers, and all those involved in the juvenile justice system.

A national conference is the most propitious mechanism, with demonstrated potential, for broadening public awareness regarding the negative effects of undetected learning disabilities and for identifying barriers which prevent these youth from receiving needed services.

5. *Home security is of vital importance to the elderly. The subcommittee, therefore, is recommending that Congress provide four mechanisms to implement a program that would install security devices in the homes of elderly residents.*

A. *Title XX of the Social Security Act should be amended to include among the services eligible for federal assistance the installation of devices that will prevent unauthorized entry and promote the security of the elderly in their homes.*

B. *Title II, Part B, Section 222(A)(12) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 should be amended to include the installation of security devices and other minor modifications to improve the security in homes of elderly residents.*

C. *Title III, Section 305(b)(4) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 should be amended to provide for broader assistance under the residential repair and renovation programs to include construction modifications and the installation of security devices.*

D. *Title III, Section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 should also be amended to include among the assistance provided, construction modifications and the installation of devices that will promote the security of the elderly in their homes.*

Burglary is the most frequent crime perpetrated against the elderly. Usually it is an inexperienced juvenile who forcibly enters the elderly's home through the front or back door by breaking a glass and slipping the lock, or by breaking a corner windowpane. Therefore, simple home modifications, especially around doors and windows and the installation of security devices would reduce both the fear of crime and actual victimization.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FEDERAL AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

1. *HUD, in its planning and development of elderly-assisted housing, must give priority to projects in which the elderly would be the sole occupants and if such projects are not feasible, certain buildings should be reserved for the elderly within projects.*

Studies have clearly illustrated that victimization and fear of crime are higher in age-integrated buildings.

2. HUD should take steps to determine which Federally assisted housing projects with large numbers of elderly residents, including those solely occupied by the aged require security personnel to reduce victimization and fear of crime. In addition, HUD must develop minimum standards and adequate guidelines to ensure that the security personnel can perform their duties proficiently.

Testimony from the hearings, as well as studies, show that security personnel are poorly trained and, generally not concerned with the problems of the residents.

3. HUD should provide funding under its research and demonstration projects to expand research in the area of environmental and building design. The primary focus of this research should be on the linkage between the physical environment and crime.

4. HUD should begin incorporating security and safety features into all Federally assisted housing, especially that occupied by the elderly. The agency has conducted and funded research and demonstration projects to study means of reducing crime. Therefore, the findings of these studies and projects should become part of HUD's housing policy whenever feasible.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

1. LEAA should fund a research project to examine means of providing security and reducing victimization among low income central city elderly. The study should focus on the forgotten elderly residing in boarding homes, hotels, and the commercial areas of a city where there is a lack of the fundamental elements of a community.

2. LEAA should continue its comparative crime surveys, such as "Criminal Victimization in the United States: A Comparison of 1973 and 1974 Findings."

The data revealed in this type of study is important because it allows researchers to view national trends in victimization rates in order to develop proper solutions to the crime problem.

3. LEAA must establish specific standards that states must meet to ensure that the problem of crime against the elderly is reflected in each state's annual crime control plan as required under Public Law 94-503.

The subcommittee is concerned that LEAA has not moved affirmatively to implement the intent of Congress.

4. LEAA must make certain modifications in victimization surveys so that they reflect a more accurate picture of crime against the elderly.

The following areas are those which need further delineation:

A. *Crime categories.* The elderly by virtue of age, health, and economics are less susceptible to some LEAA crime categories than the general population, e.g., rape and auto theft. On the other hand, the elderly are considered to be more vulnerable to crimes that were not included, e.g., fraud, bunco, medical quackery, and harassment by teenagers.

B. *Age intervals.*—Every age interval in the survey is a closed interval (e.g., 12-15, 35-49) except that of the elderly. It includes all those 65 and over. This category is too large and undifferentiated. As gerontologists explain, this category includes the young-old, middle-

old, and old-old (as distinguished by their health, habits, and lifestyles). Many people in this expanded group are not "at risk" in street crimes since they are too old and frail to leave their residences. Most studies show that crime decreases at the highest end of the aging spectrum.

C. *Use of aggregate figures.*—There are certain methodological factors in the LEAA studies which cause the subcommittee to question their application to the elderly. The use of aggregate figures, by presenting an average, tend to mask important divergencies in sub-populations, e.g., the high victimization rates experienced by elderly, inner city residents. The age interval used by LEAA (65 and over), being open-ended, subsumes too large and undifferentiated a population and tends to skew the data. The data do not reflect the "at risk" factor.

5. The subcommittee recommends that LEAA study the effects of the "at risk" factor on their crime victimization surveys.

A major purpose of the survey is to determine the probability of cohorts (age, sex, race, economic) being the victims of specific crimes. Numerous researchers in the area of elderly crime victimization express the belief that many of the elderly have already circumscribed their behavior (limiting all but essential trips in the community, avoiding certain areas in the community, eliminating absence from home after sunset). If this is the case, and the "at risk" factor is not considered, the elderly population will artifactually appear less victimized. Because the distribution of resources is justified and therefore allocated on the basis of figures such as these, a study of this phenomenon is in order.

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

1. AoA should allocate funds to develop a linkage mechanism between police departments and local service agencies.

This is necessary because police departments are being called to perform social services for which they are not trained. In addition, police departments do not have adequate resources or manpower to carry out these duties along with their other responsibilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT

The subcommittee recommends the following five programs to local jurisdictions as methods of impacting on the actual criminal victimization rate and to diminish the fear of crime.

1. Education programs that focus on methods to reduce street crime, burglary, and bunco and confidence schemes.
2. Development of community cohesion through locally based crime prevention units such as Neighborhood Watch.
3. Creation of supportive services such as
 - a. Escort and transportation
 - b. Telephone reassurance programs
4. Application of a new system in the school districts that have not already adopted a policy, whereby truants are not expelled but instead induced to remain in school.

Communities that have implemented this new program have indicated a reduction in crime against the elderly.

5. *Citizens must be encouraged to report all crimes, even harassment, to the police department.*

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS

The subcommittee recommends that full consideration be given to employment bills that have specific provisions of education, training, and jobs for teenagers.

Chapter two of this report on "the offender" clearly established that the majority of perpetrators of crime against the elderly are teenagers. A number of other studies reviewed by this subcommittee and the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency reveal that (1) the idleness of so many teenagers accounts for part of their association in crime, and (2) the rate of unemployment among teenagers is at a record high. Among minority teenagers it is almost 50 percent.

The subcommittee commends the legislative recommendations that have been developed in both the House and Senate that offer innovative and realistic approaches in education, training, and employment for young Americans.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE MARIO BIAGGI

While I am in full support of this report, I do wish to address myself to the recommendations offered to deal with juvenile criminals.

The relationship between juvenile criminals and crimes against the elderly is very clear. I have conducted three hearings in New York City since January 1976 on the elderly crime problem. It was disclosed at my hearings that as much as 40 percent of the crimes against the elderly are being committed by juveniles. In my home borough of the Bronx the average age of persons arrested for crimes against the elderly was between 16 and 19. In the State of New York some 11,000 persons between the ages of 7 and 16 have been apprehended for serious crimes. More than one half of these crimes were violent.

For these reasons, it is imperative that we recognize that the proliferation of juvenile delinquency is a crime problem as well as a social problem. The report accurately discusses the preventative aspects of juvenile crime. I support these findings and in fact I am a co-sponsor of H.R. 1137, the National Conference on Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency Act. I am also an original sponsor of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1964 which provides funds for treatment and rehabilitation of child abuse victims whom studies show can and do become juvenile criminals.

However, any recommendation on elderly crime prevention would be incomplete without support for proposals to make juvenile criminals more accountable under the law for the offenses they commit. I have introduced H.R. 1461 and 1462 which would lower the age to 15 nationally at which juveniles can be prosecuted as adults for serious crimes. My legislation also requires the fingerprinting of juveniles convicted of serious crimes and could prohibit keeping secret juvenile delinquency records in subsequent criminal prosecutions. My proposals are designed not only to insure that juveniles who prey on defenseless elderly victims are brought to justice, but are also designed to reduce the alarming rate of juvenile recidivism in this nation.

There is no one approach for solving the juvenile crime problem. We cannot continue to coddle juvenile criminals. Presently the leniency of state laws regarding juveniles crime allows juveniles to act with impunity. We must view proposals to strengthen penalties against juvenile criminals more as a tool of deterrence than of retribution. We cannot sanction the criminal behavior of those who hide behind the cloak of being juveniles. While we work to prevent the children of today from becoming the criminals of tomorrow, we must deal with the juvenile criminals of today. Our approach must be multifaceted, humane but decisive. The elderly remain vulnerable to crime. We have a responsibility to them to combat the growth of crime. I urge the Congress to address this problem at once before more elderly are driven into their homes as prisoners of fear.