

# Chapter 6

## The Victim-Offender Relationship in the Criminal Victimization of the Elderly



Peter C. Kratcoski

### Introduction

For the past several decades, the interest in the effect an aging population has on the amount of crime in a society and determining what should be an appropriate response to those elderly offenders convicted of crimes has increased. As the population of the United States gradually changed from a young nation to a maturing nation, some of the emphasis that focused on the young criminal offender changed to a focus on the older criminal offender. The children born during the “baby boomers” era of the late 1940s and 1950s are now in the senior citizen category, or approaching the age of 60. Shichor (1984, p. 17) notes, “Since the early 1970s an increasing amount of attention has been paid to crime and the elderly.” Although the majority of interest and research has focused on the older victims of crime, Shichor (1984, p. 399) reported, “Recently there has been greater interest on the problems of the elderly offenders, the patterns of offenses in which they are involved, and their handling by the criminal justice system.” National statistics on the amount of crime and those arrested for a criminal act reveal that the proportion of total crimes committed by the elderly is relatively small, less than 5%, but has increased steadily year by year. Kratcoski and Walker (1988) contented, “The sheer number of elderly offenders will increase in future years even if the rate of elderly crime remains low as a consequence of the increasing elderly population”. Their prediction turned out to be correct. In 1974, slightly more than 10% of the population was 65 years of age and older. In 1984 the proportion of those age 65 and older had risen to 11.9% of the population of the United States. The number of arrests of persons age 60 and older in 1984 was 174,169, approximately 1.9% of all arrests made during that year (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1985, p. 173). By 2009, the number of people aged 65 and older living in the United States was 39.6 million, 12.9% of the total

---

P. C. Kratcoski (✉)  
Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA

population. Predictions on the growth of the older population in the future indicate that by 2030 there will be 72.1 million persons age 65 and above (19% of the total population) living in the United States (Administration on Aging, Administration for Community Living, 2015, p. 1). Statistics on the trend in the amount of crime committed by the elderly reveal a steady increase similar to that of the elderly population growth. The Uniform Crime Report 2015 reveals (UCR, Table 38, p. 1) that there were an estimated 221,015 arrests of persons age 60 and above in 2015, and 90,159 (41.3%) of the arrests of persons were persons age 65 and older. Approximately 3.1% of the total arrests of persons age 18 and above in 2015 were age 60 and above. The number of arrests of older persons tends to decline after the age of 60, as illustrated in the arrest statistics. Of the 221,015 arrests for those age 60 and above, 59.7% were of persons in the age 60–65 category and 43.3% were of persons in the age 65 and above category.

An analysis of the types of offenses committed by the elderly reveals the same downward trend for most offenses. The number of offenses tends to decline as the ages of the offenders increase.

Kratcoski and Edelbacher (2016, p. 60) note,

When the 2013 FBI arrest statistics are compared with the 2000 arrest statistics, with age being the variable used in the comparisons (Crime in the United States, 2013, Tables 38–46), we find that the proportion of all Index Crimes arrests for the 60–64 age category and the 65 and over age category increased from less than 1–2.2%. While the percentage of arrests for Index Crimes for the elderly is still small, it is important to note that the proportion increased significantly over the more than 10 years between the two time periods.

Kratcoski and Edelbacher (2016, p. 60) continue,

When a comparison of property crime arrests for the two time periods (2000–2013) was made, the same trend of an increase in arrests for those in the older age categories was manifested. The proportion of total arrests for fraud, forgery/counterfeiting, embezzlement, receiving stolen property, and commercial vice, and arrests for family-related offenses was not significantly different when the 65 and older groups were compared for 2000 and 2013.

## Older Victims of Crime

Is it difficult to ascertain the number of victims of crime in a society? Van Dijk (2016, p. 4) has completed crime victimization surveys with colleagues in more than 80 countries. He has found that official statistics on crime and crime victimization do not provide the true picture of the amount of crime and the number of victims of crime. Reflecting on the “dark side of victimization” and why is it important for governments to know how many of crimes are committed against their populations, Van Dijk states, “First, crimes often inflict harm on ordinary people and they could and ought to be prevented. Many if not most of these crimes are never recorded by the police, and victims of these ‘dark numbers’ are unlikely to be offered any kind of services or specialized support. This, one could argue, is the basic victimological perspective on measuring the dark figure of criminal victimization.”

A large number of crimes are never reported or recorded by criminal justice agencies for a number of reasons. The reasons for not reporting listed below are especially relevant for some older offenders. These include:

- The victim may not realize that he/she was criminally victimized.
- The victim may not report the crime out of fear of being victimized again by the offender.
- The victim may not report the crime because the offender is a spouse, family member, or close friend, and thus the victim wants to avoid having them get into trouble.
- In cases of older victims, some may not have the mental capacity to make decisions.
- The victim is dependent on the services and/or financial resources of the criminal offender and does not want to upset the established living situation.
- The victim believes reporting the crime is a waste of time because the officials will not do anything to change the situation.
- The victim has a strong emotional attachment to the criminal offender and will accept the victimization even when it is of a violent nature.

Those completing an analysis of the criminal victimization of older persons must recognize that they are making conclusions based on incomplete data. For example, Mason and Morgan (2013), in a study of trends in criminal victimization, found that slightly more than half (56%) of elderly victims of violent crimes reported the crime to the police. Slightly more than 1/3 (38%) of violent crime victims in other age groups reported the crime to the police.

## Victimization Surveys

The National Crime Survey was established under the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in 1973. It was transferred to the Bureau of Justice Statistics in 1979 and renamed to be the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) in 1992. Zhang (2013, p. 175) states:

The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) is a series of surveys collecting data on criminalization victimizations of persons and households for the crimes of rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and vandalism in the United States. Using a national sample of households and rotating panel methods, about 100,000 persons 12 years old and older living in approximately 50,000 households are interviewed twice each year on the frequency, characteristics, and consequences of criminal victimization.

In a study of the extent of elder abuse victimization (National Institute of Justice 2015, p. 1), 11% of the elderly reported being maltreated one or more times during the previous year. The abuse or maltreatment consisted of one or more times of physical abuse, sexual abuse, neglect, or financial exploitation. A family member was the most frequent source of the abuse.

The National Institute of Justice (2017, p. 1), in a summary of a survey of nearly 6000 elderly individuals, noted:

- A majority (57%) of perpetrators of physical abuse were partners or spouses.
  - Half of perpetrators were using drugs or alcohol at the time of the mistreatment.
  - Three in ten perpetrators had a history of mental illness.
  - Over a third of perpetrators were unemployed.
  - Four in ten perpetrators were socially isolated.
- *Note:* Information abstracted from a Grant Report authored by Acierno, R., Hernandez-Tejada, W. & Muzzy, K. National Elder Mistreatment Study (pdf, Date Created, May 17, 2009

## Elderly Victimization by Identity Theft

In a study of identity theft, Harrell (2015, p. 1) found “An estimated 17.6 million persons, or 7% of all U.S. residents, were victims of one or more incidents of identity thefts in 2014.” The most frequent form of identity theft, almost half, was theft of bank (credit) accounts or the misuse of information on credit cards. In regard to the identity theft of the elderly, “The number of elderly victims of identity theft increased from 2.1 million in 2012 to 2.6 million in 2014.” Thus, the elderly were the victims of approximately 15% of all of the cases of identity theft in 2014, and the 65 and older age group was the only age group in which there was a significant increase in the number of identity thefts when 2012 is compared with 2014. This finding might give a signal that elderly people are being targeted.

The most common methods used to steal the identity or to steal information from the victims were (Harrell, 2015, p. 2):

- Unauthorized use or attempted use of an existing account, such as a credit or debit card or a checking, savings, telephone, online, or insurance account (referred to as a fraud or misuse of an existing account)
- Unauthorized use or attempted use of personal information to open a new account, such as a credit or debit card or a telephone, checking, savings, loan, or mortgage account (referred to as fraud or misuse of a new account)
- Misuse of personal information for a fraudulent purpose, such as getting medical care, a job, or government benefits, renting an apartment or home, or providing false information to law enforcement when charged with a crime or traffic violation (referred to as fraud or misuse of personal information)

Harrell (2015, p. 5) reports, “Of the 5.7 million victims who knew how the identity theft occurred, the most common way offenders obtained the information (26%) was to steal it during a purchase or other transaction.”

The theft of one’s identity might bring on other problems such as banking problems, failure to secure loans, loss of a good credit rating, harassment from debt collectors, and even legal problems. The elderly victims of identity theft may be

especially devastated if they do not have the knowledge on how to respond or a support group to offer assistance.

## **Financial Exploitation of the Elderly**

Based on allegations of widespread financial exploitation of mentally disabled elderly persons by their appointed guardians, a study was completed by the GAO in 2010 (Government Accounting Office (GAO), 2010, p. 1) to determine if the allegations of widespread financial exploitation of the elderly were true and whether the predominate perpetrators of the exploitation were appointed guardians.

The Government Auditing Organization (GAO) “identified hundreds of allegations of physical abuse, neglect and financial exploitation by guardians in 45 states and the District of Columbia between 1980 and 2010.” It also discovered that millions of dollars were stolen from the elderly by their guardians and many cases of physical abuse and neglect accompanied the financial exploitation. The financial guardians who exploited the older persons they were charged with protecting used a number of scams and frauds to illegally bilk the elderly of their money and, at times, property.

## **Victimization Resulting from Domestic Violence**

The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) (2017, p. 1) states, “Domestic violence is the willful intimidation, physical assault, battery, sexual assault, and/or other abusive behavior as part of a systematic pattern of power and control perpetrated by one intimate partner against another. It includes physical violence, sexual violence, threats, and emotional or psychological abuse. The frequency and severity of domestic violence varies dramatically.”

Citing several different sources, NCADV states that domestic violence accounts for 15% of all violent crimes (National Network to End Domestic Violence, 2015), and one in three women and one in four men have been physically abused by an intimate partner (Black et al., 2011).

In addition to a general summary report on victimization, the National Crime Victimization Survey makes supplementary reports on such areas as domestic violence. Truman and Morgan (2014, p. 1, 3) in a report titled “Nonfatal Domestic Violence, 2003–2012,” state,

Domestic violence includes victimization committed by intimate partners (current or former spouses, boyfriends, or girlfriends), immediate family members (parents, children, or siblings), and other relatives. It details the number, percentage and demographic characteristics of domestic violence victims, and describes victims and incident characteristics of the victim-offender relationship.

It also includes estimates of the rates of offenses committed by acquaintances and strangers for incidents of domestic violence.

An analysis of the victim-offender relationship for all types of crimes for all age groups for the period of 2003–2012 revealed that in slightly more than half (53.1%) of the cases the relationship between the offender and victim was known. For serious violent offenses, the percentage of known victim-offenders dropped to less than half, and for simple assault the offender was known by the victim in 55.1% of the incidents.

Domestic violence incidents constituted slightly more than one-fifth of all of the victimization incidents. Of these, in 14.6% of the cases, the offenses were committed by an intimate partner (spouse, ex-spouse, boy-/girlfriend), 4.3% by an immediate family member (parent, child, sibling, other relative), 31.8% by a well-known/casual acquaintance, and 38.5% of the criminal victimizations the offender was a stranger to the victim. In 8.5% of the cases the relationship between victim and offender was not known.

A study by Rosay (2016) pertaining to violence against American Indian and Alaska native women and men suggests that Native American women or Alaska Native women are much more likely to be the victims of domestic violence by an intimate partner than are non-Hispanic white women. The results of the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey found that 55.5% of the American Indian or Alaska Native women who participated in the survey claimed to have been the victim of physical violence by an intimate partner, compared to the 34.5 percent of non-Hispanic white women respondents in the survey. Rosay (2016, p. 41) reported that the amount of physical violence by an intimate partner was also higher for American Indian or Alaska Native men (43.2%), than it was for non-Hispanic white men (30.5%).

Truman and Morgan (2014, p. 11) compared the older victim (age 65 and above) with all other age categories on overall domestic violence victimization rates and characteristics. The comparisons included the sex of the victim, relationship with offender, type of offense, use of weapon, location where the victimization occurred, and the victims reporting the offense to the police. They found that, “As with overall violence, rates of domestic violence were highest for persons ages 18–24 and lowest for persons age 65 and older.” Person aged 65 and older had lower rates of violence in which the offenders were intimate partners, immediate family members, and other relatives than any other age group. In addition, persons age 65 or older had the lowest rates of violence perpetrated by acquaintances and strangers.

The victim-offender relationship for older victims was similar to that of other age groups, with the exception of the very young age group, in most of the characteristics compared. Some of the differences found were:

- Older victims were less likely to be victimized by strangers than those in other age groups.
- The domestic violence was less likely to be committed by an intimate partner.
- The domestic violence was more likely to be committed in the victim’s home or close proximity to the home of the victim.

- The older victims of domestic violence were predominately women.
- “Unlike patterns in domestic violence, persons who were never married or separated had higher rates of violence perpetrated by acquaintances and strangers than persons who were never married, widowed, or divorced” (Truman & Morgan, 2014, p. 12).

### **Box 6.1 Cases of Victim-Offender Relationship for Non-fatal Domestic Violence**

#### *Case 1: The Poker Game*

Leroy, age 74, Floyd, age 72, and several other older men were engaged in a friendly poker game at the home of Leroy. The group has been playing poker at the home of one group member every Thursday evening for several years. It was the duty of the host to provide the wine and snacks for the players. Occasionally there had been arguments over the winner of a particular hand and an occasional accusation of cheating. These conflicts would generally occur after the players had taken a few glasses of wine. On the occasion, in question Leroy and Floyd were engaged in a betting duel and Leroy had just won a large pot. Floyd was angry about losing and called Leroy a cheater. Floyd claimed the cards were “marked.” Leroy became very angry and ordered Floyd out of his house and told him never to come back again. After receiving this command from Leroy, Floyd got up and threw his glass of wine in the face of Leroy. Leroy responded by trying to take a swing at Floyd, but was stopped by the other players. They tried to calm the two down, and after some talk and an apology from Floyd, who blamed his outburst on two much “vino,” the group resumed their card game.

#### *Case 2: Robbery*

It was close to 9:30 p.m. when Mary Lou, age 78, received a knock on the door. Living alone, she was cautious about having anyone enter her home during the evening. She was also ready to go to bed. Without opening the door, she asked “Who is it?” The voice of what seemed to be a young woman answered “My name is Stephanie. I live a few streets from here and my car ran out of gas. Could I use your phone to call my father to pick me up?” Mary Lou decided to let her in to use the phone, and when she unlocked the door, a young woman and a young man rushed in the house. They demanded money from Mary Lou, and the man grabbed her arm, started to twist it, and threatened to break it if she did not get her purse and give them her money. Mary Lou, who had cashed her social security check that day, gave the couple the money she had in her purse. The young couple ran out the door with the money. Mary Lou called the police and the officer who responded asked her if she ever saw either of the criminals before and she had to answer “no.” The

(continued)

**Box 6.1** (continued)

officer warned her that you should be careful on those days when you received money because these will be the times when you are most vulnerable to being robbed. Mary Lou replied, "I outsmarted them. I hid most of my check money in my secret place. I told them all of the money I had was in my purse, but I lied." The police officer commended her for being so clever.

*Case 3: The Destruction of a Flower Garden*

Sam, age 84, generally kept to himself after the death of his wife. Shortly after their anniversary of 60 years of marriage, she developed a severe cold that turned into pneumonia and she died shortly after. Sam more or less lost interest in most things except his yard and garden. He rarely had any visitors, and on the occasions when a neighbor would stop by just to be friendly, Sam would inform the neighbor that he did not want any visitors. The rumor around the neighborhood was that Sam was senile and should be placed in a nursing home. What appeared to be Sam's only enjoyment was his yard and flower gardens. He planted a number of flowers each spring and also carefully cultivated the flowering bushes that were scattered throughout his yard. As the flowers bloomed he would sit on his porch in the late afternoon and gaze at the flowers, occasionally getting up a pulling a few weeds he noticed.

Sam was not overly friendly with his young next-door neighbors, but did respond when they greeted him with a hello or good morning when they would meet in their back yards. However, this friendly relationship changed when the neighbors purchased a big dog. The dog tended to come over to Sam's yard to "do his thing," and the neighbor never offered to clean it up. Sam tolerated the dog's mess on his lawn, but when the dog started digging up his prized flowers Sam could not hold his anger. He confronted the neighbor and warned him that if he did not keep his dog out of his yard he would take some action. The neighbor indicated that he would be careful and not let the dog loose, but at times he got out the door. Sam did not indicate what action he would take. The very next day, the dog ran out of the house and in a matter of minutes was digging out Sam's flowers.

When the neighbor saw what the dog was doing, he quickly grabbed the dog's collar and took it back into his house. He did not see Sam and thus thought, "I will apologize later for my dog's damage."

However, the dog managed to escape from the neighbor's house again and soon was back in the flower garden. A few days later, the dog became extremely ill. The neighbor rushed the dog to the vet and after examining the dog, the vet indicated that the dog appears to have been poisoned. The vet said "I might be able to save him, leave the dog with me."

Sam's neighbor strongly suspected that Sam was the person who poisoned the dog. After arriving home he rushed over to Sam's house to confront Sam, who was sitting on his back porch. The neighbor shouted "Why did you

(continued)

**Box 6.1** (continued)

poison my dog?” Sam replied “Look what your dog did to my flower bed. Those flowers were my only source of enjoyment in life.” The neighbor replied, “I am going to have you arrested, you crazy old man.” The neighbor followed through on his threat and signed a warrant to have Sam arrested.

## Older Homicide Offenders and Victims

Contrary to nonfatal violent crime, the large majority of murder and manslaughter cases are known to the police. In addition, the majority of these cases are either solved and the offender is brought to trial, the offender is known to the police and there is a search, the offender committed suicide, or the offender fled the country. Regardless of the status of the offender, it is generally possible to obtain more information on the characteristics of the offender as well as the victim offender-victim/s relationship than is typical for most other crimes. Thus, an in-depth analysis of the characteristics of the offender and victim/s, as well as the circumstances surrounding the incident and the relationship between the offender/s and victims, can be completed.

The trends in the number of homicides and non-negligent manslaughter offenses committed by the elderly have been on a steady increase during the past several decades in the United States. In 1989, there were 375 persons age 60 and above arrested in the United States for murder and non-negligent manslaughter (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1990). The number of arrests for murder and non-negligent manslaughter of men age 60 and above in the United States in 2015 was 187, approximately 2.5% of all men arrested for murder and non-negligent manslaughter in 2015 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2016a, b, Table 39). The number of women aged 60 and above arrested for murder and non-negligent manslaughter in 2015 was 24, approximately 2.4% of all of the women arrested for murder and non-negligent manslaughter in 2015 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2016a, b, Table 40). The total arrests for murder and non-negligent manslaughter in 2015 were 8533, and 211 arrests were of persons age 60 and above for murder and non-negligent manslaughter, while a small proportion of the total still is a significant number. The statistics reveal that the number of murders and non-negligent manslaughters does not seem to be affected by an increase in the ages after the age of 60–65. For example, the number of homicides for both men and women was higher for those in the 65 and above age group than for those in the 60–64 age group. This is an important factor to consider, and a thorough examination of the circumstances related to the elderly homicides must be considered to fully understand the motivation for elderly offenders to commit murder.

An increase in the number of homicides was expected when the time periods of 1989 and 2015 were compared, since as already mentioned the elderly population

in the United States increased significantly during that time period. Thus, the number does not necessarily indicate that there was a significant change in the behavior of the older persons who committed homicide during the time periods compared. In fact, Mason and Morgan (2013), found that elderly homicide rates declined 44% between 1993 and 2011 and the trend toward fewer homicides by the elderly appears to have continued, as reflected in the 2015 statistics.

The criminal behavior of older persons resulting in murder and non-negligent manslaughter needs to be examined very closely to determine if there is a trend in such behavior, either toward more fatal deaths by older offenders or less fatal deaths committed by the elderly in the United States.

A longitudinal study of homicides committed by older offenders and their victims (Kratcoski, 1992) revealed that, although there were similarities in the large majority of the older homicide cases, there were also significant differences in the situations and characteristics of the offenders and victims. The study used a data file consisting of 286 homicide offenders, age 60 and above, who committed their offense in Chicago between the years of 1965 through 1981 and 97 older homicide offenders, age 60 and above, who committed their offense in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, Cleveland being the major city in the county. The major source for the Chicago study came from police files supplied by Kathleen Block, and the source of data for the Cuyahoga County was from the files of the coroner's office and supplemented by information provided by the prosecutor's office that included the police report.

The similarities in the cases for the two areas were:

Sex of offender: Chicago 91% male, Cuyahoga County 81% male

Sex of victim: Chicago 71% male, Cuyahoga County 80%

Race of offender: Chicago 80% nonwhite, Cuyahoga County 89% nonwhite

Race of victim: Chicago 73% nonwhite, Cuyahoga County 72% nonwhite

Victim-offender relationship: Chicago related 41%, acquainted 47%, strangers/not known 12%

Cuyahoga County related 32%, acquainted 57%, strangers/not known 11%

Place of occurrence: Chicago 74% in either the home of the offender or victim 74%, Cuyahoga County 68%

Alcohol detected on victim: Chicago 33%, Cuyahoga County 32%

There were several differences in the circumstances, of the elderly homicides in Chicago cases and in the Cuyahoga County cases. For example, only 22% of the homicides in the Chicago cases occurred during or shortly after a domestic quarrel, while in the Cuyahoga County cases the proportion of homicides that occurred during or after a domestic quarrel was 67%.

The proportion of offenders who had a prior criminal record was significantly different in the two populations included in the research. For the Chicago cases, 23% of the offenders who were related to the victims had a prior criminal record, and 51% of the offenders who were not related to the victims had prior criminal records, while in the Cuyahoga County cases, only 16% of all offenders had a prior criminal record.

Another difference found was the type of weapon used to commit the murder. In Chicago a firearm was used in 63% of the cases, while in Cuyahoga County, a firearm was used in 89% of the homicides of elderly victims.

In more than 25% of the Chicago cases, there was some evidence that the victims may in some way have precipitated the situation that resulted in their deaths. The information on this variable was not included in the variable file for the Cuyahoga County cases. However, some anecdotal information taken from the case files reveals that the victim may have precipitated the homicide through a domestic argument, by assaulting the offender or by a verbal argument. The following cases are used to illustrate victim-precipitated homicides by the elderly.

**Box 6.2 Elderly Victim-Precipitated Homicides (Abstracted from the Files of Kratcoski Research on Older Offenders)**

*The Case of Joe*

After retirement from his job at a steel mill, Joe, age 67, would frequently visit a local bar in the afternoon and play poker with his friends. On the day of the incident in which he became a murder victim, he had spent the afternoon drinking beer and playing poker at the local bar located near his home. During the afternoon, Joe had been drinking a number of beers and also had lost more than twenty dollars. He decided to quit and go home and eat supper. As he entered his house, his wife, age 65, could tell by the “ugly” look on his face that he had lost some money. Joe and his wife had been married more than 40 years, and their marriage had been mostly tranquil during those years. They had raised three children, and, except for the few times Joe had struck her during an argument about his drinking, she did not have many complaints about their relationship. The situation changed, however, when Joe retired. During the time he was home, he tended to complain about every little thing she did, including wasting electricity by not turning the lights out, watching too much television, not having his meals ready when he wanted to eat, and not keeping the house clean. She was also irritated with Joe for messing up the house, leaving dirty dishes in the sink, and not picking up his clothes. In fact, she was quite happy to see him go off to the bar during the afternoons. However, on those days when he appeared to have consumed too much alcohol and was not successful in the card game, she knew he would be in an ugly mood and she had learned to keep her mouth shut and not say too much until Joe’s mood got better. However, on this day, as Joe walked in the house, she asked him “How much did you lose this time?” He replied, “That’s none of your business lady. Where’s my supper?” Joe’s wife did not say any more about his poker game loses and replied, “I will heat up the stew and it will be ready in a few minutes.” Joe was now in an argumentative mood. He asked his wife “What did you do all day, watch television or gossip on the phone with your nosey friend?” She did not reply and continued to get his supper ready to serve.

(continued)

**Box 6.2** (continued)

She placed the beef stew on the table and quietly walked away to avoid any additional criticism, but Joe was not ready to quit. He ate some of the stew and loudly proclaimed, "This stew is terrible. Where the hell is the meat? Did you eat it yourself? After 40 years of marriage you should have learned to cook by now."

Joe's wife went into the next room and pulled out the loaded revolver that was kept in the drawer for protection and walked back into the room and, standing directly in front of Joe who was still sitting at the table, shot him in the chest. She dropped the gun and called the police. By the time they arrived Joe had died.

In a statement given to the police, Joe's wife said she did not know why she killed her husband. She stated, "I just snapped."

*Case 2: Orrin*

At 11:30 p.m., police officers Mike and Doty received a call from dispatch to immediately proceed to a bar located on their beat. The report indicated that the bartender had called and there had been a shooting. The person who had committed the act was described as an older white male wearing a suit coat. The officers had been called to the bar many times during the several years they had worked together. The bar, located near a residential neighborhood, was notorious for having fights and an occasional stabbing or shooting. It was an attractive destination for some of the locals who lived in the neighborhood as well as for several different "biker" groups. The major reasons for the popularity of the bar were the pool tables, dartboards, and the wide variety of different beers served. Generally, the evenings at the bar would be peaceful, but when a fight occurred, it would be ugly, the altercations either between two or more biker groups or between a local and a biker. Firearms and knives were often used when a fight broke out. A neighborhood crime prevention group had submitted a petition to the city council to have the bar closed because it was a cause of crime in the neighborhood, but the attempt to close the bar was not successful.

Officers Mike and Doty were prepared for the worst scenario when they arrived at the bar. They decided to wait until backup arrived before entering the bar. A few minutes later, two squad cars arrived and the six officers entered the bar. They immediately spotted the suspect. He was sitting at a table and a 32 revolver was on the table. On the floor was the victim. The officers immediately called for emergency personnel. The victim had been hit in the chest and apparently would not survive.

After informing the suspect of his rights, Orrin, the suspect who lived just a few streets from the location of the bar, told the police, "I had to shoot him, he was going to kill me." The police obtained the following story from Orrin, the slenderly built older person (age 66) who committed the act. He stated,

(continued)

**Box 6.2** (continued)

“I came into the bar about 10:30 or so to have a few drinks before going to bed. The bar was crowded, but I did find a seat next to a young woman at the bar. I said hello and she responded with a hello. She did not seem to want to talk so I did not say anything more to her.” Around 11:30, a huge man came into the bar. I did not recognize him, but I did notice that he was wearing the same insignia that a number of the other patrons were wearing and I assumed he belonged to the “biker” group. The man came over to where I was sitting and yelled, “Get off the stool grandpa, you’re in my seat.” I told him I was here first and I was not getting up. He said, “I am only going to tell you one more time, get off of that stool. If you don’t get up, I throw you off.” I did not move, and the next thing I knew the man had picked me up and had thrown me on the floor. I starting swearing at him and called him a few nasty things, and he responded by saying he was going to give me a beating I would never forget. As he came toward me, I pulled out my revolver and aimed right at his chest. I had never fired the gun before, so I was not sure if I hit him or not. However, he fell down and landed close to where I was on the floor. I really thought he was going to kill me.” Statements from a few of the patrons and the bartender who had witnessed the incident collaborated the story told by Orrin.

Officers Mike and Doty decided to take the suspect to the station for booking in their squad car rather than waiting for a patty wagon to transport him. As they were traveling to the station, Officer Mike spoke to the suspect. He said, “You do not have to answer this question, but do you have a permit to carry a concealed weapon?” The answer was no. Officer Mike continued “Than why in the hell did you carry the gun into the bar?” Orrin answered, “You saw how tough and mean looking some of those guys looked. If you were an old man like me, would you go into the bar alone without having some protection?” Officer Mike answered, “I see your point, but I would not go into the bar in the first place.”

There were 15 cases of homicide-suicide cases recorded in the Cuyahoga County older homicide files. In these cases the assailant was always a male, and the circumstances were predominately related to the older offender killing his younger wife after finding out that she was having an affair, or it was a form of mercy killing in which the older offender killed his wife who was terminally ill and suffering from great pain and afterward killed himself.

Kratcoski (1988, p.254) states, “The case files used in this research revealed that many of the older offenders were known to the police and social service agencies through previous contacts. Those involved incidences of domestic violence, mental health difficulties, and applications for welfare or home nursing services. If the agency personnel who interacted with these elderly persons in earlier contacts had perceived the potential explosiveness or hopelessness of the situation and responded

to their needs”, they might have prevented the violence that ultimately occurred. There is a need for community efforts to establish rapport with elderly persons through church groups, nursing home visits, or interface with other agencies that have contact with the elderly. Fortunately, a number of government and private agencies have established the kinds of services suggested since the report was published.

## Hate Crimes Against the Elderly

Hate crimes are defined as those acts that constitute a violation of the criminal law and thus include all types of personal and property crimes, but are motivated by a bias or hatred for the person or group because of the racial, ethnic, religious, or sexual preference of the victim/s.

It is likely that a large proportion of hate crimes are never detected or reported, and thus the full amount of crime is not known, and the number of victims is also not known. Victims of hate crimes may not report the crime to the authorities out of embarrassment of being selected as a target or the damage or loss was not substantial, or they do not think anything will be done to stop the criminal activity. For example, increases in hate crimes against a particular ethnic or religious groups may be explained by some crime such as a terrorist attack, allegedly committed by a member of a particularly group. These crimes often are minor in nature, such as painting nasty words on the victim’s house, vandalizing, and making threats of violence, either verbally or via telephone. The likelihood of catching the offenders is small and thus the victims decide to do nothing. Another factor that makes it difficult to obtain exact figures on the amount of hate crimes pertains to the authorities who do not recognize that a crime was motivated by bias or hatred toward the victim and when completing the incident report do not make a reference to it fitting into the category of a hate crime law violation.

The analysis of the incidents of *hate crimes* in the publication *Hate Crime Statistics, 2014* (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2014, p. 1), reveals an increase in the number each year. In 2014 a total of 6416 offenses was recorded. The large majority of the victims of these offenses were individuals, rather than properties such as churches, schools, or government buildings. In 2015 (FBI, 2015, p. 1), the total number of offenses recorded was 6885, with 4482 against persons and 2338 against property. The number of hate crime offenses increased by seven percent in a 1-year period.

In 2015, the race or ethnicity of the known hate crime offenders was white 2761 (40.1%); black/African American 1129 (16.4%); American Indian, Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islanders 132 (1.9%); group of multiple races 304 (4.4%); Hispanic or Latino 182 (2.6%); not Hispanic or Latino 875 (12.8%); group of multiple ethnicities 27 (0.4%); and unknown race or ethnicity 844 (12.3%). The large majority of hate crimes against persons (98.9%) consisted of aggravated assault, simple assault, and intimidation. The majority (72.6%) of

hate crimes against property consisted of destruction of property/damage of property and vandalism. The largest proportion of property hate crime offenders were either white (18.2%) or unknown (18.2%).

An analysis of the victims of hate crime (FRI 2015, p. 1) reveals that the large majority of victims were individuals (83.2%), followed by business/financial institutions (4.5%), religious organizations (2.7%), government (2.0), and either the society or the victim was unknown in 7.5% of the hate crime incidents. Individuals were the target in the majority of property crimes (53.2%), followed by business/financial institutions (13.3).

The hate crimes recorded for 2015 (FBI, 2015, table data, p. 1) were also categorized on the basis of the characteristics of the victims of the hate crimes that might have motivated the offense. The victim categories include race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, disability, gender identity, and multiple bias incidents. For the single-bias offenses (6837), 61.7% were motivated by the race/ethnicity /ancestry of the victims, 20.4% by the religion of the victims, and the remaining 21.9% by either the sexual orientation of the victims, disabilities of the victims, gender identity of the victims, or motivated by multi-biases against the victims. The largest majority of victims based on race/ ethnicity were black/African Americans (54.2%), and the largest percentage of hate crimes motivated by a bias against a religion was anti-Jewish (52.1%) followed by anti-Islamic (21.9%).

For the 6885 hate crime offenses recorded in 2015 (FBI Hate Crime, Table 3, p. 1), the offender's race or ethnicity was unknown for 13.5% of the offenses. The known offenders were white for 44.1% of the offenses, black or African American for 18.1% of the cases, Hispanic or Latino for 2.9% of the offenses, and groups of multiple races and group of multiple ethnic groups for 5.3% of the cases, and in the remaining 16.1% of the offenses the offenders were American Indian/Alaska Natives, Asian, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islanders and not Hispanic or Latino.

## Older Victims of Hate Crimes

The FBI statistics on hate crimes are not categorized by either the age of the offender, if offender is known, or the age of the victim. Thus, when trying to determine how hate crime affects the elderly, one has to make several assumptions. Since the report on hate crime provides some information on the motivation of the offenders, it is possible to make some assumptions about the what proportion of the elderly, of a racial group, or an ethnic group will likely be affected. For example, the large majority of the victims of hate crimes are individuals. The motivations of the offenders can fall into a continuum at the one end the offenders motivated to play a prank on the victim as in a case of two teen age boys constructing a cross and burning it on the front lawn of an elderly African American woman who had recently moved to a community in the suburbs predominately inhabited by Caucasians. The other extreme is by the bombing of an African American church, in which both young and old parishioners are killed or hurt. In other cases, the hate crimes may be the result

of two or more youth gangs representing different ethnic groups or gangs fighting over territory, neighborhood, or school. In the first case, the elderly victim may be the only one affected. However, if the incident becomes a news story, a form of “group victimization” may develop, since all of the members of the racial group are to be psychologically affected by knowing that the hatred toward their group exists. This sense of psychological victimization, that certainly is a likely outcome in the cases of churches or homes being destroyed or vandalized, may have a much greater impact on the older person because such individuals may have experienced this hatred for a good part of their lives.

In the present age, in which hate literature and hate messages are transmitted over the Internet, those races, ethnic groups, and religious organizations that are the targets of the hate literature often feel helpless in trying to protect themselves from such victimization.

## **Older Property Crime Offenders and Victims**

The FBI categorizes such crimes as burglary; larceny-theft; motor vehicle theft; arson; forgery; counterfeiting; fraud; embezzlement; buying, selling, and possessing stolen property; vandalism; and other crimes, such as engaging in commercial vice, as property crimes.

The “dark side of crime victimization” is more illustrated by property crimes than by any other category of crimes, including crimes against persons. A large number of property crimes are never reported to the authorities for various reasons, including the fact that many victims may not even realize that they were victimized. In addition, the majority of property crimes, for example, auto theft, larceny-theft, vandalism, and others, are never solved, and the offender is not known. Victimization surveys tend to give some insight into the victim-offender relationship for some property crimes, but again the victims may not know who the offenders were, particularly in cases of theft, scams, and vandalism. As a result, the use of statistics on the number of arrests in the analysis of property crimes may lead to erroneous conclusions.

The number of property crimes known to the police and reported has fluctuated in different time periods. The total of crimes known has not always been a yearly increase. Bachand and Chressanthis (1988, p. 77) theoretically developed and empirically tested “factors that significantly affect property crime arrest rate patterns in the United States by criminals of the ages 55–59, 60–64, and 65 and older from 1964 to 1984.” They found that there was a gradual increase in the total amount of arrests for property crimes for those in the age categories included in the analysis. A more focused analysis of specified property crimes such as burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft was completed. The assumption that changes in the inflation rate, population, unemployment rate, and employment participation patterns are key independent variables in explaining crime arrest rates was confirmed for the older offenders arrested during the time period of the study. An increase in inflation, unemployment rate, and disengagement from employment resulted in an increase of arrests of older persons for burglary and larceny, but not for motor vehicle theft.

The total arrests of men aged 60 and above in 2015 for the property crimes of burglary; larceny-theft; motor vehicle theft; arson; forgery; counterfeiting; fraud; embezzlement; buying, selling, and possessing stolen property; vandalism; and position and commercial vice were 18,244. The total arrests of women aged 60 and above in the same year for the crimes listed were 11,225. The total for the property crimes listed for those age 60 and older arrested in 2015 was 29,469.

As shown in Table 6.1 (Crime Statistics for 2015 (FBI, Tables 39 and 40)), the proportion of property crimes for which men age 60 and above were arrested varies by the type of crime.

The number of property crimes, public order crimes, and minor violent crimes committed by the elderly (those age 60 and above) is a small proportion of the total, less than 5% for most crimes, and not being above 7% for neither the men nor women 60 years old and above the age of 60. It is noteworthy that both the men and women have the highest proportion of arrest for those crimes in which they have the opportunity, ability, and generally the motivation to engage in the criminal act. For example, the proportion of older men arrested for such crimes as drug abuse, drunkenness, disorderly conduct, minor assault, and vagrancy is above that for arrests for most other crimes, and the numbers may be an indication of the poor quality of life experienced by many older men, especially those who are separated from family, living alone, and not having an adequate standard of living. The older women who were arrested had even a lower proportion of arrests than the men for many crimes. The lower proportion of crimes against the family would indicate that many older women were more likely to be the victims of family violence rather than the precipitators of family violence. It is interesting to note that the male-female ratio for most of the crimes is at least 2 to 1 and even 4 to 1 for some crimes, but the arrests for embezzlement are often almost equal. This perhaps is related to men and women having similar opportunities and motivation to commit this crime.

## **Elderly Victims of Scams and Fraud**

With the advent of the Internet, advanced technological high-speed communication devices, such as the smart phone, and a growing number of people who have the skills to manipulate the high-tech communications systems, the growth of crimes carried out by such means has become a worldwide problem.

Adults of all age groups are targets for various scams. The typical scam (con game) is based on the knowledge that most people can be persuaded to give away money or personal information about their financial resources if the con artist appeals to their greed, offering them a great deal in return for a small investment. In other cases, the con artist uses other techniques to “con” the victim out of money. They may appeal to the person’s values pertaining to the notion of social justice and appeal for help for underprivileged children, abandoned animals, and other seemingly noble causes. It is often difficult for those to whom the appeals are made to determine if the organizers are legitimate. Other frauds are based on the notion that most people will provide assistance to a member of the family or a close friend if they are convinced that the person making the appeal is legitimate.

**Table 6.1** Arrests of older men and women (FBI, 2015)<sup>a</sup>

Type of crime	Total number all ages	Arrests, men age 60 +	Arrests women, age 60+
<i>All property crimes<sup>b</sup></i>			
Men	699,250	135,489 (2%)	
Women	434,069		4698 (2%)
<i>Assault (minor)</i>			
Men	598,000	17,872 (3%)	
Women	233,684		4688 (2%)
<i>Forgery/counterfeiting</i>			
Men	27,598	460 (2%)	
Women	15,085		157 (1%)
<i>Fraud</i>			
Men	62,721	1807 (3%)	
Women	39,618		962 (2%)
<i>Embezzlement</i>			
Men	6093	118 (2%)	
Women	6154		103 (2%)
<i>Stolen property (buying, receiving, selling)</i>			
Men	53,621	577 (1%)	
Women	14,720		110 (1%)
<i>Vandalism</i>			
Men	115,698	1889 (2%)	
Women	31,498		505 (2%)
<i>Drug abuse violations</i>			
Men	886,022	646 (3%)	
Women	257,999		2169 (1%)
<i>Offenses vs family, children</i>			
Men	51,598	999 (2%)	
Women	20,820		272 (1%)
<i>Driving under the influence</i>			
Men	625,927	31,001 (5%)	
Women	207,908		7825 (3%)
<i>Drunkenness</i>			
Men	253,565	12,794 (5%)	
Women	61,291		1621 (3%)
<i>Disorderly conduct</i>			
Men	214,118	6941 (3%)	
Women	84,135		1723 (2%)
<i>Vagrancy</i>			
Men	15,080	1041 (7%)	
Women	4334		161 (4%)

<sup>a</sup>Percentages have been rounded to nearest percent

<sup>b</sup>Includes burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson

**Box 6.3 Grandpa, I am in Jail (Story Based on a Recent Attempt to Scam the Author)**

The phone rang in the late evening and when answered, the voice on the other end began by saying “Grandpa, I need your help. I went to Mexico with my girlfriend for the week end and we got into a big fight and she went back home. She was going to pay the hotel bill, but did not pay it and if I can’t pay it I will have to go to jail.” The author immediately realized that the caller was not his grandson since he had seen him the previous night at a family celebration. The author responded, “Can I send you anything while you are in jail?” The caller immediately hung up the phone.

Older persons are prime targets for various scams for several reasons. They include:

- The elderly are often not educated about the types of frauds that are current in vogue.
- The elderly are often not knowledgeable about the use of computers and thus often give information to unauthorized users.
- The elderly are often living alone and do not have others to consult with when trying to determine if an appeal or offer of a “good deal” is legitimate.
- Many older persons are suffering from dementia or some other form of mental deterioration and are not capable of making a rational decision on a financial matter.
- The majority of older people were socialized in a society based on trust and word of honor. They predominately interacted with acquaintances and family members and learned from experience who could be trusted. Those who target the elderly are generally not in face-to-face interaction with the elderly and in fact are not even in a voice communications relationship. Thus the opportunity for the older person to determine the validity of the situation is generally quite limited.

**Most Frequent Scams and Frauds Against the Elderly**

Administration on Aging, Administration for Community Living (2015, pp. 1–3) lists the following as the most frequent scams targeting the elderly:

- Counterfeiting prescription drugs
- Internet fraud and e-mail phishing
- Healthcare/Medicare fraud
- Funeral and cemetery expenses scams
- Telemarketing scams
- Investment schemes
- Homeowner repair scams
- The phony banker investor scam

- Sweepstakes and lottery scams
- Homeowner/reverse mortgage scams
- Fraudulent anti-aging scams

The authors have been the target of a number of the scams listed above or some variation of the scams listed. Other stories such as, “I have to flee my country for political reasons, but I have millions of dollars to bring to the United States and need a bank account to place it in. I will share with you if you allow me to place the money in your account” or “The FBI or IRS will arrest you in the next 24 hours if you do not pay your back taxes to such an address immediately.”

## **Crime Prevention Programs Implemented to Protect Elderly Victims**

The major focus of many programs to protect elderly victims of crime has been on education. These programs are based on the assumption that older persons can do a great deal on their own to prevent many types of victimization, including being the victim of a scam and even violent crime, if they become more aware of the dangers and the types of situations that could result in becoming a victim of crime.

National Crime Prevention Council (2015, p. 1) states that the key components for a program directed at preventing the victimization of the elderly should include:

- A communications network to keep the elderly alert to potential crime
- Information and training on how to report crime
- Services to support elderly victims in dealing with the physical, emotional, and financial impacts of crime
- Access to products, training, and other services to help prevent victimization

Many of the suggestions recommended by the National Crime Prevention Council have been implemented through federal, state, and local programs. For example, on the national level, the Victims of Crime Act was passed in 1984 by the US Congress.

Kratcoski and Edelbacher (2016, p. 62) noted,

This Act established the Crime Victim Fund. The funds are used to support victim assistance and compensation programs throughout the country. All victims, regardless of their age, can apply for assistance and compensation if they have received material or physical harm from a criminal act. The Office of Victims of Crime was established in 1988. The federal agency provides grants to victim assistance programs and training for service providers.

In addition to the victim service programs funded by federal and state agencies, there are a large number of programs under private auspices. Many of the programs are directed toward assisting the victims of a specific crime, such as those directed to assisting victims of rape or domestic violence. They receive their funding from grants, local government agencies, and fund raising campaigns. Although not specifically directed toward assisting the elderly victim, older victims are not excluded from being given assistance if the victimization falls within the mission of the agency.

## Summary

As the aging population of a society increases, the victimization of the elderly population becomes a growing problem. It is difficult to determine the amount of criminal victimization of the elderly because of the “dark side of criminal victimization,” that is, a large number of crimes against the elderly are not known to criminal justice agencies because they are never reported by the victims. It is also difficult to determine the victim-offender relationship, since the majority of those crimes that are reported are never solved and thus the characteristics of the offenders are not known. Research in the form of victimization surveys reveals that for a large proportion of crimes against persons, the offenders and victims are intimately involved with each other, either as family members, relatives, or close friends. This relationship also appears to be the situation for financial victimization of the elderly.

Research has revealed that some of the violent crimes against the elderly can be characterized as “victim-precipitated” crimes. In these cases both the victim and offender had some input into the violence that ensued.

It appears as if in the circumstances surrounding a large majority of property crimes, including theft, fraud, and others, the offender and victim are not close acquaintances and in fact are strangers. This is especially true for various scams and frauds in which the elderly are the victims.

In regard to hate crimes, the victim generally is not personally targeted for the violence or property destruction that results, but is targeted more for being a member of a particular race, ethnic group, or religious group or because the person represents a sexual orientation. The elderly may be physically harmed in cases where a church, mosque, or a meeting place is bombed, since they were there in person. However, the psychological harm to those members of the group that was targeted may be more devastating to some than the actual physical harm.

The elderly appear to be especially targeted for various scam and frauds, the reason being that they may be perceived as the most vulnerable and thus “easy pickings” for the criminals who commit such scams and frauds. A number of laws and programs have been implemented for the special purpose of preventing scams and protecting the elderly victims.

## Discussion Questions

1. Discuss some of the methods (schemes) criminals have used to scam elderly persons.
2. Discuss victim-precipitated crime. What types of crimes are most likely to be victim-precipitated?
3. Based on the research on homicide presented in the chapter, what are the similarities between homicides committed by the elderly and those of other age groups/what are the major differences in the characteristics of the homicide cases?

4. Define hate crime. Discuss those situations in which the elderly are likely to be targeted for hate crimes.
5. Define public order crimes. Discuss the types of public order crimes older persons are the most likely to engage in. What are some of the ways public order crimes of the elderly can be reduced?
6. Research on identity theft reveals that the number of older persons who are the victims of identity theft has increased significantly during the past several years in the United States. What are the factors that make the older population vulnerable for being a victim of identity theft?
7. Discuss the methods used to commit financial crimes against the elderly.
8. A comparison of the arrest of elderly men and elderly woman for specified crimes reveals that the proportion of arrest for some types of crime are remarkably similar and the proportion of total arrests for other crimes are significantly different. Identify those crimes in which the proportion of arrests are different, and discuss the possible reasons for the differences between the elderly men and women.
9. The trend in the amount of crime committed by the elderly has been that of a steady increase even in those years when the overall crime has declined. Discuss the reason for the increase in crime by the elderly and why this trend is likely to continue in the future.
10. In the analysis of elderly homicides, why is it important to know the circumstances surrounding incidents before making generalizations?

## References

- Administration on Aging, Administration for Community Living. (2015). p. 1. Retrieved November 5, 2015, from [www.aoa.acl.gov/aging\\_statistics/index.aspx](http://www.aoa.acl.gov/aging_statistics/index.aspx)
- Bachand, D., & Chressanthis, G. (1988). Property crime and the elderly offender: A theoretical and empirical analysis, 1964-1984. In B. McCarthy & R. Langworthy (Eds.), *Older offenders: Perspectives in criminology and criminal justice* (pp. 76–103). New York: Praeger.
- Black, M., Basile, K., Breiding, M., Smith, S., Walters, M., Merrick, M., et al. (2011). *The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey 2010 summary report*. Retrieved July 25, 2017, from [http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/risvs\\_report2010-a.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/risvs_report2010-a.pdf)
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (1985) *Crime in the United States, 1985*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (1990). *Crime in the United States 1990*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2014). Hate crimes-2014, tables/table 1. Retrieved August 13, 2017.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2015). *Crime in the United States 2015*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2016a). *Hate crimes-2015, table 1*. Retrieved August 1, 2017, from <http://ucr.fbi.gov/hate-crime/2015/tables-and-declarations/1tabledataadcpdf>
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2016b). *Hate crimes-2015, table 2*. Retrieved August 1, 2017, from <http://ucr.fbi.gov/hate-crime/2015/tables-and-declarations/2tabledataadcpdf>

- Government Accounting Office (GAO). (2010). *Guardianships: Cases of financial exploitation, neglect, and abuse of seniors*. Retrieved August 12, 2017, from <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-10-1046>
- Harrell, E. (2015). *Victims of identity theft, 2014* (pp. 1–13). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Department of Justice.
- Kratcoski, P. (1988). An analysis of the victim/assailant relationship in non-justifiable homicides by elderly offenders. *Trends in law and mental health* (F. Koenraadt & M. Zeegers (Editors). Utrecht, The Netherlands, Gouda. pp: 247–255.
- Kratcoski, P., & Walker, D. (1988). Homicide among the elderly: Analysis of the victim/assailant relationship in older offenders. *Older offenders perspectives in criminology and criminal justice*. N.Y. Praeger.pp:62-75.
- Kratcoski, P. (1992). An analysis of cases involving elderly homicide victims and offenders. In E. Viano (Ed.), *Critical issues in victimology* (pp. 87–95). New York: Springer.
- Kratcoski, P., & Edelbacher, M. (2016). Trends in the criminality and victimization of the elderly. *Federal Probation*, 80(1), 58–63.
- Mason, B., & Morgan, R. (2013). *Crimes against the elderly (age 65 and older) for the years 2003 to 2013*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved May 11, 2015, from <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pdetails&lid=51.36>
- National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. (2017). *Domestic violence national statistics*, pp. 1–4. Retrieved July 25, 2017, from <http://domesticviolencestatistics.org/domestic-violence-statistics/>
- National Crime Prevention Council. (2015). *Strategy: Crime prevention services for the elderly*, pp. 1–3. Retrieved June 1, 2015, from <http://www.nij.gov/topics/crime/elder-abuse/pages/welcome.aspx>
- National Institute of Justice, (2015). *Extent of elder abuse victimization*. [www.nij.gov/topics/crime/elder-abuse/pages/extent.aspx](http://www.nij.gov/topics/crime/elder-abuse/pages/extent.aspx). Retrieved 5/11/2015
- National Institute of Justice (2017). *Elder Abuse*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. <https://nij.gov/topics/crime/elder-abuse/Pages/welcome.aspx> Retrieved 10/20/2017
- National Network to End Domestic Violence. (2015). *14 domestic violence courts national summary*. Retrieved July 25, 2017, from [http://nnecdv.org/downloads/Census/Dv-Courts2014/DVCOURTS14\\_NatSummary\\_Color-2-pdf](http://nnecdv.org/downloads/Census/Dv-Courts2014/DVCOURTS14_NatSummary_Color-2-pdf)
- Rosay, A. (2016). *Violence against American Indian and Alaska Native women and men*, *National Institute of justice journal* 277, Oct (pp. 40–45). Laurel, MD: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Shichor, D. (1984). The extent and the nature of law breaking by the elderly: A review of arrest statistics. In E. Newman & M. Gewitz (Eds.), *Elderly criminals* (pp. 17–32). Cambridge: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.
- Truman, J., & Morgan, R. (2014). *Nonfatal domestic violence, 2003-2012*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Van Dijk, J. (2016). Illuminating the dark figure of crime: Victimization surveys and beyond. *Criminology in Europe*, 15(3), 4–9.
- Zhang, Y. (2013). National crime victimization survey (NCVS). In J. Wilson (Ed.), *The Praeger handbook of victimology* (pp. 175–177). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.