



The author(s) shown below used Federal funding provided by the U.S. Department of Justice to prepare the following resource:

Document Title: National Elder Mistreatment Survey: 5 Year Follow-up of Victims and Matched Non-Victims

Author(s): Ronald Acierno

Document Number: 252029

Date Received: August 2018

Award Number: 2014-MU-CX-0003

This resource has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. This resource is being made publically available through the Office of Justice Programs' National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

FINAL SUMMARY OVERVIEW

Grant #	NIJ 2014-MU-CX-003
Grantee Organization Name	Medical University of South Carolina
Grant Start Date and End Date	January 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018
Project Title	National Elder Mistreatment Survey: 5 Year Follow-up of Victims and Matched Non-Victims
Principal Investigator (PI)	Acierno, Ronald, Acierno@musc.edu 843-792-2949

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of the completed project was to follow the first National Elder Mistreatment Study, which provided prevalence estimates, with a second study of a subset of the same participants to measure the effects of elder abuse in terms of (1) health and mental health outcomes and (2) criminal justice system participation and satisfaction, as well as to specify additional predictors of these effects.

2. SUBJECTS

Data were collected from 774 older adults 8 years following their participation in Wave I of the NEMS. This represented the results of contacting every locatable participant who reported psychological, physical, or sexual (but not financial) abuse at Wave I (achieved subsample $n = 183$ of the original 753 Wave I victims) and a comparison sample of 591 randomly selected Wave I non-victims from the remaining 2,149 working phone numbers of the original 5024 non-victims (at Wave I). As mentioned, financial abuse classification at Wave I was not used to identify the victim subgroup prior to sampling, however retrospective analysis indicated that the two aforementioned sampling groups (every working phone number of Wave I victims of psychological, physical, and sexual abuse AND every working phone number of the 2,149 comparison Wave I participants) accounted for all but 7 financial abuse victims identified as such at Wave I (i.e., no other financial abuse victims at Wave I could have possibly been re-contacted). The cooperation rate (upon contact), for Wave I victims of psychological, physical, or sexual abuse was 66%; the cooperation rate of comparison Wave I participants was 57%. (Note: we had originally proposed to conduct propensity matching once the sample of Wave I victims was re-contacted, however by conserving funds during this first phase, we were able to expand from

propensity matching to random selection of a much larger group of over 2,149, for a final derived sample of 774. This does not preclude future analysis using propensity matching).

Overall, 183 (23.6%) participants reported experiencing either emotional (n = 163, 21.1%), physical (n = 18, 2.3%), sexual (n = 3, 0.4%), or neglectful (n = 2, 0.3%) mistreatment since turning 60 years (ie, elder abuse since age 60) at Wave I, indicating that our oversampling of mistreatment cases from Wave I was successful. We used 'any mistreatment since age 60 at Wave I' to classify adults as elder abuse victims or non-victims, rather than 'past year mistreatment at Wave I' because this sampling frame occurred 8 years following the original Wave, and the distinction between 'past year' and 'any since ae 60' was largely irrelevant. Instead, the relevant comparisons were between elder abuse victims at Wave I (not just recent victims) and non-victims at Wave I in terms of current, past year outcomes. Demographic information, overall, and in terms of Wave I mistreatment status are given in Table 1. Married individuals were significantly more likely to report having experienced mistreatment at Wave I, as were those reporting experiencing prior trauma, poor health at Wave I, low income, that they needed help with DLTs, and low social support at Wave II.

3. DESIGN AND METHODS

Extensive detail regarding the NEMS Wave I methodology is provided in Acierno et al. (2010) and summarized here. Note, although financial abuse by family was also assessed in NEMS Wave I, present analyses are limited to the traditional forms of abuse studied in younger adults and adolescents (i.e., psychological/emotional, physical, sexual, and neglectful) to allow comparison with existing literatures of other age groups.

Sampling:

The original sample of 5,777 adults age 60 and above was collected during 2008 by the AbtSRBI survey research firm and derived using stratified random digit dialing with an area probability sample based on Census-defined 'size of place' parameters with the continental US serving as the sampling location. Interviews were conducted in either English or Spanish. Standardized computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) procedures were used to query participants about a variety of mistreatment experiences, potential correlates, and demographics. The NEMS Wave I cooperation rate was 69%, and was calculated according to the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) Rate # 2 as the number of completed interviews,

including those that screen out as ineligible, divided by the total number of completed interviews, terminated interviews, and refusals to interview.

The follow-up NEMS Wave II was also collected by CATI in 2016 under the direction of AbtSRBI. An auto-dialing program tested each phone number used in NEMS Wave I to test whether it was still in operation. This yielded 3,973 operative phone numbers of the original 5,777, including 752 participant numbers who reported being the victim of psychological, physical, or sexual mistreatment since age 60 at Wave I. Note that because these were land lines, an operative number may have been assigned to another household in the intervening 8 years, or respondents may no longer live in the household. Thus, reaching an 'operative number' is not necessarily the same as reaching a 'participant', a relevant factor when calculating cooperation rates (see below). Because the mistreated group was more limited in size, contact attempts were made for all working phone numbers of participants reporting mistreatment at NEMS Wave I. In addition, a randomly selected subsample of operative phone numbers from Wave I comparison participants who did not report Wave I mistreatment were also called (N = 2,149). As with the NEMS Wave I, the cooperation rate was calculated using the AAPOR Rate #2. Note, screen-outs occurred when individuals answered an operative number but disclosed that the original participant was no longer available for participation due to unknown relocation or death; thus, screen outs are not refusals. Among those operative numbers dialed where participants were available, cooperation rates were 66% for the NEMS Wave I since age 60 mistreated group (N = 183) and 57% for the comparison group (N = 591), for a total follow-up NEMS Wave II sample of 774.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

In Step 1, descriptive data on variable prevalence, overall and in terms of Wave I mistreatment status, were derived and compared. In Step 2, two-tailed bivariate χ^2 analyses examined risk of predicted variables (eg, depression, GAD, PTSD, poor self-reported health, reporting abuse to authorities, etc) in relation to NEMS Wave I mistreatment, demographic variables, health ratings, prior trauma exposure, required assistance with DLT's, and NEMS Wave II social support. In Step 3, only those risk variables that reached a cutoff of $p < .05$ in bivariate analyses, as well as interaction terms between mistreatment and social support, were examined with respect to their relative risk of each health outcome type in separate logistic regression analyses with α set a priori at $p < .05$. Note: Wave II, rather than Wave I social support was used in the bivariate and multivariate models to identify a contemporary target for intervention to mitigate the negative effects of elder mistreatment.

5. FINDINGS

Wave II Completer vs. Non-completer Comparisons: As mentioned above, cooperation rates (i.e., once reached by telephone, they agreed to participate) were higher for those reporting Wave I victimization (66%) vs. those who did not report victimization at Wave I. In addition, Wave II completers were more likely to report emotional (chi square = 59.5, $p = .000$) and physical (chi square = 3.5, $p = .049$) abuse at Wave I, were significantly younger ($F_{(1, 5776)} = 76.7$, $p = .000$), had higher levels of education ($F_{(1, 5776)} = 33.9$, $p = .000$), and higher levels of income ($F_{(1, 4443)} = 36.5$, $p = .000$). There were no differences in Wave II participation rates in terms of gender (chi square = 0.1, $p = .398$) or Wave I sexual (chi square = 0.1, $p = .508$) or financial abuse (chi square = 2.78, $p = .059$).

Victimization Findings: Victims of psychological, physical or sexual elder abuse at Wave I were 4.7 times as likely as non-victims at Wave I to also report victimization at Wave II (20.5% vs. 5.2%; CI: 2.9 – 7.9).

Psychopathology Findings: Victims of elder abuse at NEMS Wave I reported significantly higher rates of past year Depression (13.1% vs. 5.1%), GAD (7.1% vs. 1.7%), PTSD (8.2% vs. 1.2%), and poor self-reported health (39.9% vs. 23.2%) compared to non-victims (See Tables 2, 3, 4 & 5 for Odds Ratios predicting Depression, GAD, PTSD, and Health, respectively). Slightly different sets of variables were associated with each outcome, with the exception of low Wave II social support, which was universally related to all negative health/mental health outcomes. Specifically, in bivariate analyses Wave II depression was associated with the following Wave I variables: elder mistreatment, lower age, lower income, poor health, needing assistance with DLTs, and low Wave II social support. GAD at Wave II was associated with the following Wave I variables: elder mistreatment, lower age, poor health, needing assistance with DLTs, and low Wave II social support. PTSD at Wave II was associated with the following Wave I variables: elder mistreatment, lower income, poor health, prior trauma, needing assistance with DLTs, and low Wave II social support. Finally, poor self-reported health at Wave II was associated with the following Wave I variables: lower income, unemployment, poor health, prior trauma, needing DLT assistance, and low Wave II social support. The unique significant predictor set for each health / mental health outcome was then included in a logistic regression for that outcome. Considering Wave II depression: mistreatment, younger age, poor health at Wave I, low Wave II social support, and the interaction between mistreatment and social support were uniquely predictive. For Wave II GAD: unique predictors were younger age, needing DLT assistance at Wave I, and low Wave II social support.

The only unique predictor of Wave II PTSD was Wave I elder mistreatment. Finally, for Wave II poor self-reported health: unemployment, poor self-reported health, prior experience of traumatic events, needing DLT assistance, and low Wave II social support were uniquely predictive.

Overall, NEMS Wave II data indicated that even the effects of past mistreatment were diminished in terms of depression, and entirely nullified for GAD and self-reported poor health when current social support was considered. Conversely stated, with the exception of PTSD, high social support at Wave II appeared to inoculate older adults against negative effects of mistreatment 8 years earlier at Wave I for most outcomes. Table 7 provides statistical analyses illustrating risk relationships between financial mistreatment, perpetrator status, and outcomes. Chi square analysis indicated that likelihood of reporting symptoms consistent with a diagnosis of depression was significantly increased in those reporting past year financial mistreatment (OR = 5.05; CI = 2.61 – 9.76). Subsequent analysis within only the subgroup of those reporting financial abuse indicated that risk of depression was significantly increased (i.e., by 480%) when mistreatment was perpetrated by family members. Similarly, risk of PTSD was significantly more likely among those reporting past year financial mistreatment (OR = 4.33; CI = 1.63-11.46) vs. those reporting no mistreatment. However, perpetrator status did not significantly increase risk of PTSD. For GAD, risk of being financially abused significantly increased likelihood of the disorder (OR = 3.14; CI = 1.13 - 8.76) but perpetrator status was not differentially associated with risk. Finally, financial abuse significantly increased likelihood of reporting poor health (OR = 1.82; CI = 1.07 – 3.09), however perpetrator status did not significantly affect outcome.

Although not often conceptualized in terms of its emotional and health effects, financial mistreatment was associated with significantly increased likelihood of depression, PTSD, GAD, and poor self-rated health. Moreover, when perpetrators of financial mistreatment were family members or friends, risk of negative outcomes was increased for depression, and trended in this direction GAD and poor self-rated health. Surprisingly, the increased risk of psychopathology and perceived poor health associated with financial abuse was roughly comparable with that reported for an aggregate measure of emotional, physical, or sexual elder abuse (Acierno et al., 2017). That is, financial abuse may produce more than just economic hardship, but also may result emotional and health consequences similar to other forms of mistreatment

Data regarding financial mistreatment perpetrator status were available from 60 financial abuse victims. Forty percent (n = 24) indicated that the perpetrator was family/friend/acquaintance vs. 60.0% (n = 36) stranger

perpetration). Similarly, 65 participants provided data regarding emotional mistreatment perpetrator status, with 86.2% (n = 56) perpetrated by family/friend/acquaintance and 13.8% (n = 9) perpetrated by strangers. Table 8 presents comparisons of non-reporting rates for each mistreatment type in terms of perpetrator status. Considering financial mistreatment, fully 87.5% of those indicating that they experienced family/friend perpetrated events failed to report the crime to authorities, compared to 33% of those experiencing financial mistreatment at the hands of strangers (see Table 1 for statistical data). By contrast, no difference was observed in rates of non-reporting emotional mistreatment, with failure to report evident in 89.9% of family/friend perpetrated abuse and 83.3% of stranger perpetrated mistreatment.

Table 9 outlines the reasons given for not reporting financial mistreatment to police or other authorities, again with chi square statistical comparisons framed (for each reason) in terms of stranger vs. family/friend/acquaintance-perpetration. Common reasons for not reporting financial abuse by strangers included fear of looking foolish (30%) and not knowing how to report (40%); whereas common reasons for not reporting financial abuse by family/friend/acquaintance included not wanting to get the perpetrator in trouble (52.4%; the only statistically significant difference between perpetrator types that was observed) and not wanting publicity (38.1%). Table 10 gives the reasons for not reporting emotional mistreatment, in terms of perpetrator type, with associated chi square statistics. Differences again emerged with respect to not wanting to get the perpetrator in trouble as a reason for non-reporting (39.3% of family/friend/acquaintance vs. 6.7% of stranger perpetrated emotional mistreatment), and not wanting publicity (43% of family/friend/acquaintance vs. 13.3% stranger emotional mistreatment).

6. IMPLICATIONS FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE POLICY AND PRACTICE

The enduring negative health and mental health effects of elder mistreatment, including financial mistreatment are clearly evident from the NEMS Wave II 8-year follow-up data, although these effects appear to be mitigated, in large part, by current social support. Moreover, if the negative health effects of abuse prevented some original participants from engaging in this follow-up study wave, for example, if negative health effects are manifest as hospitalization and even death in some cases, the relationship between mistreatment and negative outcomes may be even more pronounced (in that abused NEMS Wave I participants would be more likely to be very ill, hospitalized or deceased, and hence unavailable for Wave II survey participation). Of perhaps greatest relevance are findings isolating the unique risk of negative outcomes associated with each

factor while controlling for every other factor. These analyses revealed that demographic variables such as sex, income, and employment status were not terribly relevant to mental health or health rating outcomes once the effects of Wave I mistreatment, Wave I DLT assistance needs, and Wave II social support were considered. In other words, the relevance of these three latter targets, and social support in particular, as points of intervention is very high.

Considering the question of reporting elder abuse to police or other authorities, our data indicate that elder financial mistreatment perpetrated by family, friends, and acquaintances is far less likely to be reported than the same behaviors perpetrated by strangers. Indeed, almost 90% of both forms of elder mistreatment by family, friend, or acquaintance was not reported. Surprisingly, rates of non-reporting of emotional mistreatment at the hands of strangers was also about 85-90%. The failure to report emotional mistreatment across perpetrator types, in the context of a willingness to report other forms of mistreatment when perpetrated by a stranger, suggests that victims of this form of abuse may not be aware that it is a type of illegal behavior. This implies that education is needed across agencies and the general population regarding emotional abuse, its negative effects, and methods of reporting to police and other authorities. Even though the rate of not reporting stranger-perpetrated financial mistreatment was better than that observed for family/friend/acquaintance perpetrated crime, it was still unacceptably high at about 33%. We found that reasons offered for not reporting to police and other authorities differed for stranger perpetrated vs. family/friend/acquaintance perpetrated mistreatment, with 'not wanting publicity' and 'not wanting to get the perpetrator in trouble' as recurring themes for non-report of abuse by family and friends, while no consistent reason was offered as primary for failure to report stranger perpetrated mistreatment. Lack of trust in the criminal justice system, and in its ability to render justice, likely played a role.

PROJECT PUBLICATIONS:

Acierno, R., Hernandez-Tejada, M., Anetzberger, G., Loew, D., & Muzzy, W. (2017). The National Elder Mistreatment Study: An Eight-Year Longitudinal Study of Outcomes. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect*, 29, 254-269. DOI: 10.1080/08946566.2017.1365031

Acierno, R., Watkins, J., Hernandez-Tejada, M.A., Froom, Steedley, M., & Anetzberger, G. (in press). Mental health correlates of financial mistreatment in the National Elder Mistreatment Study Wave II. *Journal of Aging and Health*. DOI: 10.1177/0898264318767037

Acierno, R., Steedley, M., Hernandez-Tejada, M.A., Froom, G., Watkins, J., & Muzzy. (in press). Relevance of perpetrator identity to reporting elder financial and emotional mistreatment. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*. DOI: 10.1177/0733464818771208

Acierno, R. (2017). A comment on Wong and Waite, "Elder mistreatment predicts later physical and psychological health: Results from a national longitudinal study," *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect*, 29, 186-187. DOI 10.1080/08946566.2017.1310074.

Hernandez-Tejada, M; Froom, G; Steedley, M; Watkins, J; Acierno, R (in press). Demographic-Based Risk of Reporting Psychopathology and Poor Health Among Mistreated Older Adults in the National Elder Mistreatment Study Wave II. *Aging and Mental Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2018.1509296>

TABLES

Table 1: Characteristics of the total sample in terms of Wave I mistreatment status.

Characteristic	Mean / N (%/SD)	Wave I Mistreatment n (SD/%)	No Wave I Mistreatment n (SD/%)	F / X ² , p
Mean Age (years)	79.6 (7.0)	78.3 (6.6)	80.0 (7.1)	8.30, .00
Sex (Female)				0.26, .34
Male	253 (32.7%)	57 (31.1%)	196 (33.2%)	
Female	521 (67.3%)	126 (68.9%)	395 (66.8%)	
Race				12.19, .09
White	702 (90.7%)	161 (88.0%)	541 (91.5%)	
Black	39 (5.0%)	9 (4.9%)	30 (5.1%)	
American Indian	12 (1.6%)	6 (3.3%)	6 (1.0%)	
Asian	2 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.3%)	
Hispanic	15 (1.9%)	5 (2.7%)	10 (1.7%)	1.00, .27
Marital status WI				9.11, .01
Married	417 (54.1%)	88 (48.4%)	329 (55.9%)	
Divorced/Single	163 (21.1%)	53 (29.1%)	110 (18.7%)	
Widowed	191 (24.8%)	41 (22.5%)	150 (25.5%)	
Needs DLT Help WI	237 (30.7%)	92 (50.3)	145 (24.6%)	43.38, .00
Prior Trauma WI	469 (60.8%)	131 (71.6%)	338 (57.5%)	11.65, .00
Poor Health WI	130 (16.8%)	44 (24.0%)	86 (14.6%)	8.95, .00
Income 35k or less WI	551 (72.5%)	134 (73.6%)	417 (72.1%)	0.15, .39
Low Social Support WII	269 (34.8%)	74 (40.4%)	195 (33.0%)	3.41, .04
	195 (25.2%)	72 (39.3%)	123 (20.8%)	25.45, .00

Note: The F and X² statistics were used to test for significant difference between continuous and categorical variables, respectively. DLT: Daily Living Tasks; WI: Wave I; WII: Wave II.

Table 2: Wave II Depression in terms of Wave I mistreatment, control variables and Wave II social support.

	% Depressed	N	χ ²	OR	CI	p
<i>Depression Wave II</i>						
Mistreatment		774	13.91	2.82	1.60 – 5.00	.00
Yes	13.1	24				
No	5.1	30				
Age		774	6.65	2.28	1.20 – 4.33	.01
77 or Less	8.9	41				
78 or Greater	4.1	13				
Sex		774	0.01	0.97	0.54 – 1.74	.51
Female	6.9	36				
Male	7.1	18				
Race		752	0.34	1.33	0.50 – 3.49	.36
Non-White	8.6	5				
White	6.6	46				
Income		774	7.48	2.14	1.23 – 3.73	.01
\$35k or Less	10.4	28				
\$35.01k or Greater	5.1	26				
Employment Status		760	1.91	1.64	0.81 – 3.34	.12
Unemployed	7.6	42				
Employed	4.8	10				
Health		773	36.1	5.04	2.84 - 8.95	.00
Poor	19.2	25				
Good	4.5	29				
Prior Trauma		771	0.83	1.31	0.73 – 2.34	.22
Yes	7.7	36				
No	6.0	18				
Needs DLT Help		773	12.26	2.63	1.51 – 4.59	.00
Yes	11.8	28				
No	4.9	26				
Social Support Wave II		774	43.9	5.90	3.31 – 10.54	.00
Low	17.4	34				
High	3.5	20				

Note: The first value given is the risk variable, and a positive odds ratio indicates increased risk for that characteristic (i.e., younger age, female, lower income, unemployed, poor health, prior trauma, DLT assistance, Wave I mistreatment, Wave II low social support). All predictor variables are Wave I unless otherwise specified. DLT: Daily Living Tasks

Table 3: Wave II Generalized Anxiety Disorder in terms of Wave I mistreatment, control variables and Wave II social support.

<i>0</i>	% GAD	N	χ^2	OR	CI	<i>p</i>
<i>Generalized Anxiety Wave II</i>						
Mistreatment		774	14.19	4.44	1.91 – 10.31	.00
Yes	7.1	13				
No	1.7	10				
Age		751	5.34	3.36	1.13 – 9.97	.02
77 or Less	4.1	19				
78 or Greater	1.3	4				
Sex		751	0.06	1.11	0.45 – 2.74	.51
Female	3.1	16				
Male	2.8	7				
Race		752	1.12	1.94	0.56 – 6.75	.24
Non-White	5.2	3				
White	2.7	19				
Income		751	0.00	1.00	0.42 – 2.39	.58
\$35k or Less	3.0	8				
\$35.01k or Greater	3.0	15				
Employment Status		737	0.02	1.08	0.42 – 2.77	.55
Unemployed	3.1	17				
Employed	2.9	6				
Health		750	5.47	2.75	1.14 – 6.62	.03
Poor	6.2	8				
Good	2.3	15				
Prior Trauma		748	1.70	1.86	0.72 – 4.76	.14
Yes	3.6	17				
No	2.0	6				
Needs DLT Help		750	13.32	4.46	1.86 – 10.67	.00
Yes	6.3	15				
No	1.5	8				
Social Support Wave II		751	20.12	5.95	2.48 – 14.26	.00
Low	7.7	15				
High	1.4	8				

Note: The first value given is the risk variable, and a positive odds ratio indicates increased risk for that characteristic. All predictor variables are Wave I unless otherwise specified. DLT: Daily Living Tasks.

Table 4: Wave II Post-traumatic Stress Disorder in terms of Wave I mistreatment, control variables and Wave II social support.

	% PTSD	N	χ^2	OR	CI	<i>p</i>
<i>Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Wave II</i>						
Mistreatment		774	24.88	7.45	2.99 – 18.67	.00
Yes	8.2	15				
No	1.2	7				
Age		774	1.69	1.86	0.72 – 4.81	.14
77 or Less	3.5	16				
78 or Greater	1.9	6				
Sex		774	0.01	1.04	0.42 – 2.59	.57
Female	2.9	15				
Male	2.8	7				
Race		752	0.10	1.27	0.29 – 5.59	.49
Non-White	3.4	2				
White	2.7	19				
Income		774	3.91	2.31	1.00 – 5.42	.04
\$35k or Less	4.5	12				
\$35.01k or Greater	2.0	10				
Employment Status		760	0.99	1.73	0.58 – 5.18	.23
Unemployed	3.3	18				
Employed	1.9	4				
Health		773	13.28	4.38	1.85 – 10.37	.00
Poor	7.7	10				
Good	1.9	12				
Prior Trauma		771	6.20	4.21	1.23 – 14.35	.01
Yes	4.1	19				
No	1.0	3				
Needs DLT Help		773	8.61	3.40	1.43 – 8.06	.01
Yes	5.5	13				
No	1.7	9				
Social Support Wave II		774	13.81	4.52	1.90 – 10.76	.00
Low	6.7	13				
High	1.6	9				

Note: The first value given is the risk variable, and a positive odds ratio indicates increased risk for that characteristic. All predictor variables are Wave I unless otherwise specified. DLT: Daily Living Tasks.

Table 5: Wave II self-reported health in terms of Wave I mistreatment, control variables and Wave II social support.

	% Poor	N	χ^2	OR	CI	p
Health						
<i>Self-Reported Health Wave II</i>						
Mistreatment		550	19.10	2.19	1.54 – 3.13	.00
Yes	39.9	71				
No	23.2	134				
Age		755	1.48	0.82	0.59 – 1.13	.13
77 or Less	25.6	116				
78 or Greater	29.6	89				
Sex		550	3.38	1.39	0.98 – 1.99	.07
Female	29.2	149				
Male	22.9	56				
Race		752	0.05	0.94	0.51 – 1.72	.48
Non-White	25.9	15				
White	27.2	184				
Income		550	6.15	1.52	1.09 – 2.11	.01
\$35k or Less	32.7	85				
\$35.01k or Greater	24.2	120				
Employment Status		550	15.07	2.21	1.47 – 3.32	.00
Unemployed	31.2	167				
Employed	17.0	35				
Health		549	121.8	8.55	5.62 – 13.01	.00
Poor	66.9	85				
Good	19.1	120				
Prior Trauma		548	14.96	1.98	1.40 – 2.81	.00
Yes	32.2	147				
No	19.3	57				
Needs DLT Help		550	77.46	4.43	3.14 – 6.24	.00
Yes	48.9	110				
No	17.8	94				
Social Support Wave II		550	23.54	2.35	1.66 – 3.34	.00
Low	40.7	77				
High	22.6	128				

Note: The first value given is the risk variable, and a positive odds ratio indicates increased risk for that characteristic. All predictor variables are Wave I unless otherwise specified. DLT: Daily Living Tasks.

Table 6: Logistic Regressions: Predicting Self-Reported Psychopathology and Health Status in terms of variables identified as significant bivariate predictors of these outcomes.

Variable	OR	95% CI	B	W	n
<i>Depression Wave II</i>					
Mistreatment	1.50	0.79 – 2.86	.41	1.53	.22
Younger Age	2.76	1.39 – 5.50	1.02	8.37	.00
Lower income	1.42	0.76 – 2.62	.35	1.23	.27
Poor Health	3.38	1.77 – 6.45	1.22	13.63	.00
Needs DLT Help	1.58	0.82 – 3.04	.46	1.86	.17
Social Support Wave II	4.66	2.52 – 8.63	1.54	24.01	.00
<i>Generalized Anxiety Wave II</i>					
Mistreatment	2.21	0.89 – 5.51	.79	2.91	.09
Younger Age	4.19	1.36 – 12.92	1.43	6.23	.01
Poor Health	1.30	0.49 – 3.14	.26	.27	.60
Needs DLT Help	3.33	1.25 – 8.82	1.20	5.83	.02
Social Support Wave II	4.40	1.77 – 10.92	1.48	10.21	.00
<i>Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Wave II</i>					
Mistreatment	4.32	1.62 – 11.55	1.46	8.51	.00
Low Income	1.35	0.53 – 3.44	.30	.41	.52
Poor Health	2.36	0.90 – 6.19	.86	3.07	.08
Prior Traumatic Event	2.33	0.65 – 8.35	.85	1.68	.19
Needs DLT Help	1.43	0.55 – 3.73	.36	.53	.47
Low Social Support Wave II	2.49	1.00 – 6.28	.91	3.74	.05
<i>Self-Reported Health Wave II</i>					
Mistreatment	1.41	0.92 – 2.17	.34	2.43	.12
Low Income	1.01	0.68 – 1.50	.01	.00	.98
Unemployed	1.72	1.08 – 2.74	.54	5.26	.02
Poor Health	5.85	3.72 – 9.22	1.77	58.19	.00
Prior Traumatic Event	1.49	1.00 – 2.23	.40	3.87	.05
Needs DLT Help	2.77	1.87 – 4.11	1.02	25.94	.00
Low Social Support Wave II	1.73	1.15 – 2.62	.55	6.79	.01

Note: the level of the variable given first represents the reference value of the variable, which is also the level the variable hypothesized to be associated with increased risk. Confidence Intervals that do not cross the value 1.00 indicate increased (if CI ranges above 1.00) or reduced (if CI ranges below 1.00) risk for the reference value of the variable. All predictor variables are Wave I unless otherwise specified.

Table 7. Mental health correlates of financial abuse in the total sample, and within the subset of those reporting financial mistreatment, in terms of perpetrator status.

Mental Health Correlate	%	n	χ^2	OR	CI	p
Major Depressive Disorder			27.58	5.05	2.61-9.76	.000
No Financial Abuse	5.5	39				
Financial Abuse	22.7	15				
Perpetrator is Stranger	11.1	4	5.91	4.80	1.27-18.11	.018
Perpetrator is Family/Friend	37.5	9				
Posttraumatic Stress Disorder			10.20	4.33	1.63-11.46	.008
No Financial Abuse	2.3	16				
Financial Abuse	9.1	6				
Perpetrator is Stranger	11.1	4	0.12	0.73	0.12-4.32	.544
Perpetrator is Family/Friend	8.3	2				
Generalized Anxiety Disorder			5.31	3.14	1.13-8.76	.039
No Financial Abuse	2.5	18				
Financial Abuse	7.6	5				
Perpetrator is Stranger	5.6	2	0.91	2.43	0.37-15.76	.311
Perpetrator is Family/Friend	12.5	3				
Poor Health			5.02	1.82	1.07-3.09	.021
No Financial Abuse	26	180				
Financial Abuse	39.1	25				
Perpetrator is Stranger	26.5	9	3.37	2.78	0.92-8.39	.060
Perpetrator is Family/Friend	50.0	12				

Table 8: Non-Reporting to Police in terms of perpetrator status (i.e., Stranger vs. Family/Friend) across Mistreatment type (i.e., Financial and Emotional).

Mistreatment Type	%	n	χ^2	OR	CI	p
<i>Financial Mistreatment</i>						
Not Reported to Police			16.6	14.00	3.42 – 57.33	.000
Stranger	33.3	11				
Family/Friend	87.5	21				
<i>Emotional Mistreatment</i>			0.70	1.79	0.45 – 7.04	.311
Not Reported to Police						
Stranger	83.3	15				
Family/Friend	89.9	107				

Note: Odds Ratio above 1 indicates increased risk associated with the "Family/Friend/Acquaintance" category.

Table 9. Comparison of reasons for not reporting past year financial mistreatment by a stranger vs. a family member or other trusted individual such as a friend.

Financial Mistreatment	%	n	χ^2	OR	CI	p
<i>Reasons for not Reporting to Police</i>						
Didn't want others to know			0.42	1.80	0.30 – 10.87	.425
Stranger	18.2	2				
Family/Friend	28.6	6				
Afraid to look foolish			0.47	0.55	0.10 – 3.12	.401
Stranger	30.0	3				
Family/Friend	19.0	4				
Didn't want to be in trouble			8.12	2.10	1.34 – 3.29	.004
Stranger	0.0	0				
Family/Friend	52.4	11				
Feared reprisal			0.54	2.35	2.30 – 23.81	.428
Stranger	9.1	1				
Family/Friend	19.0	4				
Didn't want publicity			2.60	5.52	0.58 – 52.63	.116
Stranger	10.0	1				
Family/Friend	38.1	8				
Didn't know how to report			2.56	0.25	0.04 – 1.45	.128
Stranger	40.0	4				
Family/Friend	14.3	3				

Table 10. Comparison of reasons for not reporting emotional mistreatment by a stranger vs. a family member or other trusted individual such as a friend.

Emotional Mistreatment	%	n	χ^2	OR	CI	p
<i>Reasons for not Reporting to Police</i>						
Didn't want others to know			1.17	2.30	0.49 – 10.85	.230
Stranger	13.3	2				
Family/Friend	26.2	28				
Afraid to look foolish			.034	1.59	0.33 – 7.58	.431
Stranger	13.3	2				
Family/Friend	19.6	21				
Didn't want to be in trouble			6.12	9.05	1.15 – 71.37	.010
Stranger	6.7	1				
Family/Friend	39.3	42				
Feared reprisal			0.07	1.23	0.25 – 5.94	.576
Stranger	13.3	2				
Family/Friend	15.9	17				
Didn't want publicity			4.85	4.90	1.05 – 22.80	.023
Stranger	13.3	2				
Family/Friend	43.0	46				
Didn't know how to report			1.93	0.41	0.12 – 1.48	.157
Stranger	26.7	4				
Family/Friend	13.1	14				

Note: an Odds Ratio above 1 indicates increased risk associated with the "Family/Friend/Acquaintance" category