Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

VOLUME XLIX MARCH 1985 NUMBER 1

This Issue in Brief

A Diversionary Approach for the 1980's.—Various changes in social thought and policy of the past several years carry important implications for the treatment of young offenders. These changes include a marked decrease in public willingness to spend tax money for social programs, a shift in focus from offender-rights to victim-rights, and an increase in the desire for harsher treatment of serious offenders. The general social ethos reflected in those positions has prompted a reassessment and new direction for the delivery of juvenile diversion services in Orange County, California. Authors Arnold Binder, Michael Schumacher, Gwen Kurz, and Linda Moulson discuss a new Juvenile Diversion/Noncustody Intake Model, which has successfully combined the collaborative efforts of law enforcement, probation, and community-based organizations in providing the least costly and most immediate level of intervention with juvenile offenders necessary to protect the public welfare and to alter delinquent behavioral patterns.

Home as Prison: The Use of House Arrest.—Prison overcrowding has been a major crisis in the correctional field for at least the last few years. Alternatives to incarceration—beyond the usual probation, fines, and suspended sentences—have been tried or proposed. Some—such as restitution, community service, intensive probation supervision—are being implemented; others have simply been proposed. In this article, authors Ronald P. Corbett, Jr. and Ellsworth A.L. Fersch advocate house arrest as a solution to prison overcrowding and as a suitable punishment for many nonviolent, middle-range offenders. The authors contend that with careful and random monitoring of offenders by special probation officers, house arrest can be both a humane and cost-effective punishment for the offender and a protection to the public.

CONTENTS

explains that exclusionary rules developed to keep illegally obtained evidence from being used in court and that both arrests and searches can occur without a warrant in specific circumstances.

Assessing Correctional Officers:—Authors Cindy Wahler and Paul Gendreau review the research on correctional officer selection practices. Traditionally, selection of correctional officers was based upon physical requirements, with height and size being a primary consideration. A number of studies have employed the use of personality tests to aid in the identification of the qualities of "good" correctional officers. These assessment tools, however, have provided qualities that are global and not unique to the role of a correctional officer. Noting a recent trend towards a behavioral analysis within the field personnel selection, the authors argue that a similar type of analysis may provide a more fruitful avenue for assessment of correctional officers.

Forgotten People: Elderly Inmates

BY GENNARO F. VITO and DEBORAH G. WILSON*

IN GENERAL, when people consider the words "crime" and "criminal," a stereotypic image of a young, male offender develops. Crime in our society is viewed as a "young man's game." In 1982, 53.1 percent of all individuals arrested for the F.B.I.'s Uniform Crime Reports Index Crimes were under 19 years of age and 75 percent were under 25 years of age. These data support the contention that street crimes are the province of the young.

Similarly, when the words "crime" and "elderly" are used in combination, the word "victim" seems to logically follow. This thought process, however, overlooks the fact that, while elderly victimization constitutes a serious problem, the elderly can and do function as a criminal group. As the Newmans have written (1982:1), America is clearly "greying," and as the population moves toward a society of middle-aged and elderly persons, a new breed of criminal is drawing attention: the elderly offender.

Prior research suggests that the numbers of elderly offenders are increasing. For example, in their examination of arrest patterns contained in the Uniform Crime Reports, Shichor and Kobrin (1978) found that arrests of elderly persons (55 and over) for Index Crimes increased by 22.4 percent—a rate substantially higher than the overall increase of 43 percent for the general population. Similarly, an examination of the change in arrests for Index Crimes per 100,000 for the elderly (55 years of age and older) from 1970 to 1980 reflect increases of from 77 to 89 percent. This rate represents the largest percent change for any age group.

Eventually, elderly offenders can become elderly inmates. In 1974, elderly inmates (50 years and older) constituted 8 percent of the total national state prison population (U.S. Department of Justice, 1979: 46-47). This translates into 8,354 individuals 50 years and older who were incarcerated in state facilities. While more current statistics are not available, it seems safe to conclude that given the increases in the number of elderly offenders, the numbers—if not the proportion—of elderly inmates in state correctional facilities have increased and will continue to do so. Elderly inmates, then, will come to be an increasingly prominent institutional constituency and a group with potential special needs which must be addressed.

This article seeks to accomplish three goals: 1) to identify the special needs and problems of elderly inmates, 2) to show how this group of inmates and its special needs and problems will continue to grow, and 3) to explore strategies and propose options for confronting the existing and growing special needs posed by the elderly inmate group. It is hoped that this information can then be utilized to take proactive measures to resolve the current and pending special needs of elderly inmates.

The Elderly in Prison

The problems and special needs of elderly inmates can be categorized into five groups: 1) adjustment to imprisonment, 2) vulnerability to victimization, 3) adaptation to physical conditions, 4) lack of suitable programs, and 5) diversity of the elderly inmate population.

Adjustment to Imprisonment

Prior research suggest that while older inmates may be better adjusted and less disruptive in the institution, many appear to have psychological and emotional characteristics which suggest that they have institutional adjustment problems which are not being met. Wolfgang (1964a, b), Mabli, et al. (1979), and Flanagan (1983) agree that older inmates are better adjusted and are less of a problem for correctional administrators (as measured by rates of misconduct) than younger inmates. In fact, both Mabli, et al. and Wolfgang suggest age mixing as a possible form of control within the institution. Similarly, Teller and Howell (1981) found older prisoners to be better adjusted than younger offenders: less socially deviant, impulsive, and hostile. This was especially ture of older prisoners who were first incarcerated at a young age. In fact, Wiegand and Burger (1979) suggest that prison officials often do not encourage elderly inmates to leave because of the "quietening effect" they have on an institution.

In a study of the involvement of older inmates in the activities of various social institutions, Reed and Glamser (1979) found little difference between elderly inmates and elderly civilians. Elderly inmates, like their "freeworld" counterparts, found religion to be more important as they aged, engaged

*Gennaro F. Vito is an associate professor and Deborah G. Wilson is an assistant professor, School of Justice Administration, College of Urban and Public Affairs, University of Louisville.

in more prayer and bible reading as they grew older, were more interested in politics, and paid more attention to the media than did younger individuals. Additionally, the elderly inmates, though not likely to have friendships based on trust, did participate in organizations in the institution. Most (15 out of 19) reported that they felt younger than their counterparts on the outside. Reed and Glamser felt that this was because "much of what is viewed as part of the normal aging does not take place in the prison-setting...the elderly inmates were not exposed to heavy industry, hard labor, or heavy drinking. They eat well, rest often, and have ready access to medical care." Many of the problems faced by the elderly, such as: access to transportation, proximity to others, a need to decrease activities as the environment becomes more of a challenge, the identity crisis caused by retirement, loss of status and social devaluation, as well as social cues to remind them of their chronological age, are absent in the institutional setting. As a result, the sociopsychological effects of aging may not be felt.

While these studies describe elderly inmates as well-adjusted inmates who live quietly and "do their time with little notoriety," other studies paint quite a different picture. Panton (1977), in an analysis of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory scores of elderly inmates in North Carolina, found less psychopathy but more anxiety, despondency, insecurity, and inadequacy among older inmates relative to a baseline of randomly selected inmates. He also reported that older prisoners are more demanding, self-centered, and naive, though less hostile toward authority, than younger inmates.

Other researchers have reported similar findings which suggest that in prison the older inmate is dependent, frightened, and depressed (Gillespie and Galliher, 1972; Bergman and Amir, 1973; Rodstein, 1975; Krajick, 1979). Additionally, older inmates are often mocked and given little status recognition by other inmates (Bergman and Amir, 1973).

Potential for Victimization

Krajick (1979) and Weigand and Burger (1979) report that victimization and fear of victimization by younger, stronger inmates is a serious problem for elderly inmates. Additionally, due to their social security status, elderly inmates possess resources which their younger cellmates do not—a fact which is well recognized by the predatory element on the inside.[1] Thus, while elderly inmates do not typically represent a security risk, the protection of such inmates can present a vexing problem for administrators.

Physical Conditions

Even the physical conditions and structure of the institutions create problems for the elderly inmates. Prisons were not designed with the elderly in mind. Steel and cement make a structure cold and damp, and the stairs present in most facilities may be a problem. Typically, most elderly inmates find living in close quarters with younger offenders a strain (Krajick, 1979: 38):

> Younger guys, they be ripping up and down the hall, racing. You better stand aside or get out of the way, or you be sure to get run over .... I admit to God I done wrong, but tell me, does a 67 year old man need to be cooped up in a place like this?

Most prison programs were designed for younger offenders and often exclude the elderly. As Wiegand and Burger (1979: 49-50) have indicated, there are two forms of bias at work. First, there is the idea that "you can't teach an old dog new tricks." Elderly offenders are viewed as past their prime and as unpromising candidates for long-term improvement. Second, the "squeaky wheel" syndrome is also in operation. Most elderly inmates do their time with little notoriety, do not call attention to themselves, and as a result, they can have a calming effect on the institution. In fact, one expert cited by Krajick (1979: 35) believes that elderly offenders are "very select and prized inmates" who constitute "good insurance against future Atticas." For this reason there is a tendency for administrators either to ignore them or to set "nursing home prison" facilities which tend to segregate and isolate the elderly inmates. Third, there is a motivational problem also functioning as an obstacle to the formation of meaningful programs. Elderly inmates may not be physically able to take part in work or exercise programs. They often lack the spirit to take up other pursuits even when they could obviously benefit from them. For example, Table 1 reveals that the majority of elderly inmates did not graduate from high school—a pattern which is even more pronounced for black inmates aged 45 and over. Yet, Krajick (1979: 41) found that many elderly inmates are embarrassed to admit their lack of education, especially if they are unable to read or write.

These frustrations are coupled with the physical, intellectual, and emotional deterioration brought on by long confinement (Adams and Vedder, 1961).

---

[1] Editor's note: The Social Security Amendments of 1983, Public Law 98-21, Title III §339(b), 97 Stat. 134 amended the Social Security Act and required the suspension of benefits to convicted felons while they are incarcerated. The new provisions are found in: Title 42 U.S.C. §402(x).

TABLE 1. STATE SENTENCED INMATES, AGE 45 AND OVER, BY RACE AND HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED PRIOR TO IMPRISONMENT (1974)

Highest Grade Completed	Number of White Inmates	Percent of Total	Number of Black Inmates	Percent of Total
None or Kindergarten	103	0.9	252	5.3
Elementary				
1-4	772	7.0	1076	22.7
5-7	1640	14.8	1350	28.5
8	1190	10.8	499	10.5
High School				
1-3	3527	31.9	1033	21.8
4	2561	23.2	383	8.1
College				
1-3	1061	9.6	126	2.7
4	152	1.4	22	0.4
5 or more	40	0.4	0	0.0
TOTAL	11046	100.0	4741	100.0

Source:

Profile of State Prison Inmates, pp.62-63.

Together they create bitterness and resentment among older inmates who blame the institution and its conditions for their physical and mental deterioration. These factors increase anomie among older inmates and they become pessimistic about their present and future status as time passes (Gillespie and Galliher, 1972).

Diversity

Most elderly inmates are male (from 85 to 98.3 percent, depending upon state jurisdiction), half are white, less than a third (30 percent) are married, and—at best—a little over one-fourth (28.6 percent) have a high school education (Goettinger, 1983). Most have a prior arrest record (McDonald and Grossman, 1982), prior convictions (Panton, 1977), and most (64.3 percent) were sentenced at 50 years of age or older (U.S. Department of Justice, 1979:48). Older prisoners are more likely to have been convicted of a violent crime (61 percent) (U.S. Department of Justice, 1979:46-47), especially if they are serving their first sentence (Teller and Howell, 1981; Krajick, 1979; McDonald and Grossman, 1981; Goetting, 1983).

While these general characteristics of the group can be identified, elderly inmates are not a homogeneous group. Some are first-incarcerated elderly who are experiencing their first institutionalization as older individuals. Some are multiple- or serial-incarcerated recidivists who are being reincarcerated as elderly inmates. The last group includes long-time incarcerated who, because of a lengthy sentence given in their youth, have aged in institutions (Teller and Howell, 1981; Goetting, 1983). Those in each category differ in the type of crimes for which they are usually incarcerated (Schroeder, 1936; Bergman and Amir, 1973; Teller and Howell, 1981; Newman and Newman, 1982; Goetting, 1983), their similarity to younger inmates (Teller and Howell, 1981), and the form of their adjustment to the institution (Rodstein, 1975; Aday and Webster, 1979). For example, elderly offenders appear to commit more violent crimes (Shichor and Kobrin, 1978; Newman and Newman, 1982) or at least are incarcerated more often for violent crimes (Teller and Howell, 1981). This is especially true if the elderly inmate is a first-time incarcerated older offender. Multiple-incarcerated elderly inmates tend to be more involved in property crime, more likely to have a criminal identity, and more like younger inmates than the first-time incarcerated elderly offender (Teller and Howell, 1981). Additionally, the first-time incarcerated elderly offenders tend to be better adjusted to the institution (Teller and Howell, 1981) while those who age in prison are more likely to be overly dependent on the institution (Aday and Webster, 1977) and to assume one of the two divergent roles of either informant or inmate father figure (Rodstein, 1975).

Population Trends

Several social and population trends suggest that the problems confronting elderly inmates and those who must manage elderly inmates will continue to grow in the future. As the elderly age group continues to grow in size and in proportion of our population, the total arrests of the elderly will continue to increase. Simultaneously, as the elderly population continues to grow in size, many of the stereotypic assumptions about this group will change. Opportunities for the elderly to commit crimes may increase and the hesitance of the police and courts to prosecute may decrease and consequently more elderly will be arrested. For example, as Table 2 shows, the increase in the rates of arrest per 100,000 from 1970 to 1980 was greatest for those individuals 50 and older. Additionally, as the general age distribution of individuals arrested each

TABLE 2. RATES OF ARREST PER 100,000 FOR INDEX CRIMES 1970, 1980 AND CHANGE IN RATE OF ARREST PER 100,000 1970-1980 BY AGE GROUP*

Age Category	Arrest Per 100,000 1970	Arrest Per 100,000 1980	Percent Change In Arrest Per 100,000
18 and under	920.92	1381.61	+50.0
19-24	1457.76	2250.18	+54.4
25-29	777.53	1300.69	+67.3
30-34	538.17	854.82	+58.8
35-39	393.15	608.44	+54.8
40-44	283.27	459.53	+62.2
45-49	198.95	341.10	+71.5
50-54	142.93	250.50	+75.3
55-59	102.01	180.01	+76.5
60-64	71.38	129.49	+81.4
65+	34.17	64.50	+88.8

*Arrests for arson were subtracted from total arrests for each age category in 1980 to guarantee comparability.

TABLE 3. PERCENT CHANGE IN TOTAL ARRESTS FOR INDEX CRIMES BY AGE GROUP, 1978-1982

Age Category	Percent Change in Total Arrest
18 and under	-12.0
19-24	+08.0
25-29	+26.0
30-34	+41.0
35-39	+32.0
40-44	+20.0
45-49	+07.0
50-54	+05.0
55-59	+16.0
60-64	+24.0
65+	+20.0

year changes, so will the structure of the age distribution within institutions. For example, in Table 3, most of the increases in total arrests for Index Crimes from 1978 to 1982 occurred among individuals 30 to 39 years of age. Offenders in this category are not going to be diverted from the adult system because of juvenile status nor are they likely to be diverted or receive a shorter sentence because of a youthful offender status. Likewise, these offenders have had more time than their younger counterparts to accumulate prior records which would decrease the likelihood of a reduced sentence and increase the probability that they could be charged under persistent felony offender or habitual offender statutes. They will then spend a longer time in an institution.

The increased probability of lengthier sentences and increased use of habitual offender statutes with life without parole, mandatory sentencing, persistent felony offender statutes, and restricted use of automatic good-time credits mean that these offenders—who constitute the bulk of the recently incarcerated—have a greater likelihood of aging in the institution. As the character of the elderly inmate group changes, so will its needs.

The data on changes in the arrest rates of the elderly do exhibit relatively large increases, especially for those individuals 55 years of age and older. However, a closer examination of the type of crimes for which these changes are occurring for various age groups provides additional insight into the nature of future elderly inmates and their needs.

For the 50-54 age group, arrests for property crimes increased by 11 percent between 1978 and 1982 (see Table 4). During this period, the greatest

TABLE 4. UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS, TOTAL ARRESTS FOR INDEX CRIMES, 1978-82 AGE GROUP 50-54

Index Crimes	1978	1979	Percent Change	1980	Percent Change	1981	Percent Change	1982	Percent Change	Percent Change 1978-82
Murder	602	578	-04	467	-19	518	+11	479	-08	-20
Forcible Rape	398	405	+02	391	-03	426	+09	403	-05	+01
Robbery	648	563	-13	622	+11	678	+08	623	-08	-04
Aggravated Assault	7090	6501	-08	6470	-01	6621	+02	6277	-05	-12
Burglary	2057	1955	-05	1933	-01	2106	+08	2056	-02	0
Larceny-Theft	17747	18302	+03	18815	+03	20710	+11	20370	-02	+15
Motor Vehicle Theft	808	699	-13	636	-09	708	+11	705	-00.4	-12
TOTALS	29348	29003	-01	29334	+01	31767	+08	30913	-03	+05
Personal Crime	8736	8047	-08	7950	-01	8243	+04	7782	-06	-11
Property Crime	20612	20956	+02	21384	+02	23524	+10	23131	-02	+11

TABLE 5. UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS, TOTAL ARRESTS FOR INDEX CRIMES, 1978-82 AGE GROUP 55-59

Index Crimes	1978	1979	Percent Change	1980	Percent Change	1981	Percent Change	1982	Percent Change	Percent Change 1978-82
Murder	360	379	+05	349	-08	404	+16	374	-07	+04
Forcible Rape	224	214	-04	238	-11	262	+10	223	-15	-00.4
Robbery	304	359	+18	333	-07	369	+11	365	-01	+20
Aggravated Assault	4255	4231	-01	4110	-03	4284	+04	4002	-07	-06
Burglary	1054	1124	+07	1187	+06	1328	+02	1160	-13	+10
Larceny-Theft	12637	13179	+04	14314	+09	16242	+13	15808	-03	+25
Motor Vehicle Theft	415	407	-02	377	-07	388	+03	427	+10	+03
TOTALS	19249	19893	+03	20908	+05	23277	+11	22359	-04	+16
Personal Crime	5143	5183	+01	5030	-03	5319	+06	4964	-07	-03
Property Crime	14106	14710	+04	15878	+08	17958	+13	17395	-03	+23

increase was for larceny-theft (15 percent) while arrests for violent personal crime decreased by 11 percent.

Arrests for property crimes between 1978 and 1982 also dramatically increased for 55-59 age group by a rate of 23 percent (see Table 5). Again, the greatest increase among property crime arrests was for larceny-theft (25 percent). Although personal crime arrests for this age group registered an overall decline of 3 percent, arrests for robbery during this period actually increased by 20 percent.

The age group 60-64 is the first group to generate an increase in arrests for both personal and property crimes between 1978 and 1982 (see Table 6). Arrests for personal crimes increased by 3 percent with the highest increase recorded for robbery (57 percent). Arrests for property crimes increased by 31 percent with burglary leading the way (51 percent increase).

Finally, the age group 65 and over yielded an arrest rate pattern for Index Crimes which was similar to that revealed among the 50-54 and 55-59 age groups (see Table 7). Overall, the greatest increase in arrests we registered in the area of property crimes (26 percent) with larceny-theft again the leader (27 percent increase).

The following conclusions can be made concerning these arrest statistics. Overall, the number of arrests for personal crimes for all age groups declined

TABLE 6. UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS, TOTAL ARRESTS FOR INDEX CRIMES, 1978-82 AGE GROUP 60-64

Index Crimes	1978	1979	Percent Change	1980	Percent Change	1981	Percent Change	1982	Percent Change	Percent Change 1978-82
Murder	224	225	+00.4	201	-11	230	+14	193	-16	-14
Forcible Rape	104	125	+20	108	-14	134	+24	126	-06	+21
Robbery	107	137	+28	170	+24	177	+04	168	-05	+57
Aggravated Assault	2470	2307	-07	2317	+00.4	2542	+10	2494	-02	+00.1
Burglary	433	509	+18	551	+08	728	+32	655	-10	+51
Larceny-Theft	8357	8915	+07	9574	+07	11172	+17	10909	-02	+31
Motor Vehicle Theft	160	176	+10	138	-22	180	+30	186	+03	+16
TOTALS	11855	12394	+05	13059	+05	15163	+16	14731	-03	+24
Personal Crime	2905	2794	-04	2796	+00.7	3083	+10	2981	-03	+03
Property Crime	8950	9600	+07	10263	+07	12080	+18	11750	-03	+31

TABLE 7. UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS, TOTAL ARRESTS FOR INDEX CRIMES, 1978-82 AGE GROUP 65 AND OVER

Index Crimes	1978	1979	Percent Change	1980	Percent Change	1981	Percent Change	1982	Percent Change	Percent Change 1978-82
Murder	285	304	+07	248	-18	310	+25	249	-20	-13
Forcible Rape	126	130	+03	107	-18	143	+34	111	-22	-12
Robbery	212	157	-26	151	-04	198	+31	152	-23	-28
Aggravated Assault	2457	2389	-03	2424	+01	2544	+05	2509	-01	+02
Burglary	572	460	-20	527	+15	743	+41	575	-23	+00.5
Larceny-Theft	11279	12223	+08	12857	+05	14847	+15	14364	-03	+27
Motor Vehicle Theft	194	147	-24	164	+12	233	+42	209	-10	+08
TOTALS	15125	15810	+05	16478	+04	19018	+15	18169	-04	+20
Personal Crime	3080	2980	-03	2930	-02	3195	+09	3021	-05	-02
Property Crime	12045	12830	+07	13548	+06	15823	+17	15148	-00.4	+26

between 1978 and 1982. The only exception was for the 60-64 age group (3 percent increase in personal crimes) which registered a 57 percent increase for robbery arrests. The arrest pattern for property crimes was one of substantial increase, primarily for the crime of larceny-theft. Here again, the sole exception was the 60-64 age group which revealed a 51 percent increase for burglary. On this basis, it seems that the 60-64 age group is involved in the type of serious crime, robbery and burglary, which could result in incarceration. The involvement of each age group in property crime, particularly larceny-theft, could be a result of the economic pressures faced by a person on a fixed income as well as the fact that crimes such as shoplifting are opportunistic and require no specific, specialized skill (Newman and Newman, 1982: 6). Specifically, as the elderly commit more felony property offenses—unless they are diverted from the system at higher rates—the criminal history and possibly the criminal identity of elderly inmates may come to be more similar to that of younger inmates. Therefore, the nature of adjustments to institutionalization and the needs of this elderly inmate group may change. Nonetheless, what is clearly evident is that the *size* of this group and therefore its needs and problems will continue to grow.

Policy and Program Implications

First and foremost, elderly inmates must be recognized. Corrections officials and administrators must recognize that prisons and prison programs are designed for the "average" young offender. Some awareness of the diversity in the inmate population must be developed so that the special needs of groups, such as the elderly prisoner, are recognized and met.

Some more specific suggestions would be to house elderly inmates in a separate wing or unit of the institution away from the younger inmates. This is not to suggest complete segregation and isolation. If older inmates elect to be placed in the general population and have no physical, mental, or social limitations that would create security risks, they should be allowed to do so. This housing facility should be secure but accessible. Also, it should have minimal drafts and dampness which can aggravate the physical condition of many elderly inmates and should have restroom and bathing facilities which are designed to safely accommodate the handicapped and less physically able. Stairs should be minimal, and distances from various facilities in the institution, i.e., the dining hall, library, canteen, and recreation room should be minimized. These facilities in the institution should be made more accessible through the use of ramps.

Similarly, educational, vocational, recreational, and rehabilitation programs should be expanded to accommodate the needs of the elderly. The programs should be offered in locations which are physically accessible to the elderly. Older inmates should be encouraged to participate in these programs, and the programs should be structured to facilitate participation. For example, separate basic education classes for the elderly should be offered. They should be geared to meet the slower pace of elderly learners. More importantly, providing separate classes for the elderly will reduce embarrassment and frustration they might feel because of this lack of competence. Likewise, vocational pro-

grams incorporating arts and crafts geared to the elderly could be offered. Recreational programs should include activities that do not require a great deal of physical activity: i.e., cards, board games, checkers, and movies and music that meet the tastes of the elderly. However, some limited physical activity should also be available: i.e., walks, special exercise classes, shuffleboard, and horseshoes to minimize the lethargy and health problems that come from a sedentary life. Rehabilitation programs should be administered by psychologists and counselors with special training in geriatrics so that there will be a greater awareness of the special social, psychological, and emotional needs of these inmates.

The diversity of this group must be recognized and incorporated into the rehabilitative programs. For example, the elderly first offender should be integrated into institutional life differently than the elderly repeat or serial offender. Upon arrival at the institution, the elderly first offender is likely to be more anxious, fearful, and depressed than the repeat or serial offender. Again, staff—both treatment and custodial—should receive training in the special needs of geriatrics so that they will be more attuned to the special needs and problems of this subgroup within the institution.

While reform of this type could meet many barriers: e.g., popular sentiment and budget limitations, many of the programmatic changes could be implemented at limited cost but with great benefit for inmates, staff, and corrections administrators. The growing number of elderly inmates present both a problem and an opportunity. If left in their current situation, elderly inmates will continue to be a problem as they remain forgotten. However, as the number of these inmates grows, it will become not only increasingly necessary, but increasingly justifiable to implement specialized programs and facilities. Some attention to current needs that exist can prevent the need for "crisis-management" in the future. It is going to be increasingly difficult to ignore this elderly constituency. Corrections, like other social institutions in society, must be prepared for the "greying of America."

References

Adams, M. E. and Vedder, C. B. "Age and Crime: Medical and Sociologic Characteristics of Prisoners over 50," *Geriatrics*, April 1961, pp. 177-181.

Aday, R. H. "Toward the Development of a Therapeutic Program for Older Prisoners," *Offender Rehabilitation*, 1977, *1*, pp. 343-348.

Aday, R. H. and Webster, E. L. "Aging in Prison: The Development of a Preliminary Model," *Offender Rehabilitation*, 1979, *3*, pp. 271-282.

Bergman, S. and Amir, M. "Crime and Delinquency among Aged in Israel, an Experience Survey," *The Israel Annals of Psychiatry and Related Disciplines*, 1973, *11*, pp. 33-48.

Flanagan, T. J. "Correlates of Institutional Misconduct among State Prisoners," *Criminology*, 1983, *21*, pp. 29-37.

Gillespie, M. W. and Galliher, J. F. "Age, Anomie and the Inmate's Definition of Aging in Prison: An Exploratory Study," in P. Kent, R. Kastenbaum and S. Sherwood (eds.), *Research, Planning and Action for the Elderly*. Behavioral Publications, Inc.: New York, pp. 465-483.

Goetting, A. "The Elderly in Prison: Issues and Perspectives," *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 1983, *20*, pp. 291-309.

Krajick, K. "Growing Old in Prison," *Corrections Magazine*, 1979, *5*, pp. 32-46.

Mabli, J., Holley, S. D., Patrick, J. and Walls, J. "Age and Prison Violence: Increasing Age Heterogeneity as a Violence-Reducing Strategy in Prisons," *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 1979, *6*, pp. 175-186.

MacDonald, D. G. and Grossman, J. "Survey of Inmates 65 Years Old and Over, February, 1981." State of New York, Department of Correctional Services, 1981.

Newman, D. J. and Newman, E. S. "Senior Citizen Crime," *The Justice Reporter*, 1982, *2*, pp. 1-7.

Panton, J. H. "Personality Characteristics of Aged Inmates within a State Prison Population," *Offender Rehabilitation*, 1977, *1*, pp. 203-208.

Reed, M. B. and Glamser, F. D. "Aging in a Total Institution: the Case of Older Prisoners," *The Gerontologist*, 1979, *19*, pp. 354-360.

Rodstein, M. "Crime and the Aged," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1975, *234*, p. 639.

Schroeder, P. L. "Criminal Behavior in the Later Period of Life," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1936, *92*, pp. 915-924.

Shichor, D. and Kobrin, S. "Criminal Behavior Among the Elderly." *The Gerontologist*, 1978, *18*, pp. 213-218.

Teller, F. E. and Howell, R. J. "The Older Prisoner," *Criminology*, 1981, *18*, pp. 549-555.

U. S. Department of Justice. *Profile of State Prison Inmates: Sociodemographic Findings from the 1974 Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

Vedder, C. B. and Keller, O. J., Jr. "The Elderly Offender, Probation, and Parole," *Police*, September-October, 1968, pp. 14-15.

Wiegand, N. and Burger, J. C. "The Elderly Offender and Parole," *The Prison Journal*, 1979, *59*, pp. 48-57.

Wolfgang, M. E. "Age, Adjustment, and the Treatment Process of Criminal Behavior," *Psychiatry Digest*, July, 1964a, pp. 21-35.

_____ "Age, Adjustment, and the Treatment Process of Criminal Behavior," *Psychiatry Digest*, August, 1964b, pp. 23-31.