



Sociodemographic profiles and violent events experienced by the elderly: a descriptive study

Andréa Mathes Faustino¹, Leides Barroso de Azevedo Moura¹, Lenora Gandolfi¹

1 Brasília University

ABSTRACT

Aim: to present the sociodemographic profile, and to identify the violent events of various types (physical, psychologic, sexual, abandonment, negligence, financial abuse, and self-negligence) in elderly people residing in the Metropolitan Area of Brasília, Brazil. **Method:** This is a transversal and descriptive study, in which the elderly were actively asked if they had already suffered any sort of violence. **Results:** The sample consisted of one hundred and thirty one elderly people, with an average of 70 years. 68% were women, 41% were married, 41% were mullatos, 50% were illiterate, 90% lived with other relatives, and 52% had an income of up to 3 minimum wages. With regard to the types of violence experienced, 72% reported such unpleasant experiences after they were 60 years of ge, being the psychological violence being the most frequently mentioned (34%). **Conclusion:** The profile of the elderly people who suffer the most is that of a young senior, female, who lives with a relative (especially the spouse or children), with low level of education and income, and that had experienced other psychological violence outbursts after the age of 60.

Descriptors: Violence; Aged; Elder Abuse.

INTRODUCTION

There are many definitions for the violence and the mistreatment with regard the elderly. The most commonly used, in Brazil is the definition given by the World Health Organization, which describes the concept as "...the set of actions or omissions that occurred once or more times, harming the physical and emotional integrity of the elder, impeding the fulfillment of the person's social role"^(1,2), and is also included in the Brazilian Elder's Statement. Other authors have introduced the perspective that it involves a single occurance, or a repeated one, that occurs in any sort of relationship in which an expectation of trust is in place, and the happening generates damage or anguish with regard the elderly person⁽³⁾.

The risk factors involved in abusive situations among elders are dementia, physical impairment, depression, solitude or lack of social support, consumption of alcohol or illicit drugs, experience of conflictive situations with the caregiver, and the reduction of functional and cognitive capacity. These situations tend to link to dependency during the caring moments of basic and instrumental activities in everyday life, increasing their exposure to mistreatment generated by family, or by formal or institutional caregivers^(4,5,6).

With regard to the nature of violence, it can be either physical, which is the use of physical force, aiming to hurt a person; psychological, with verbal or gesture aggression; sexual, described by a sexual act or play performed against the individual's will, or when the elder is unable to consent; abandonment, seen by the lack of care on the part of the legal representative; negligence, which is a denial of care on the part of the person responsible for the elder; financial and/ or material exploitation, or the non-consent use of financial and/or material assets of the elder; and self-negligence, which can be described as a behavior pattern that places the elder's health and safety at risk^(1,7).

The importance of identifying violent situations among elderly people is recognized, and it is known that there is still a gap regarding the observation of this phenomenon in the Metropolitan Area of Brasília (MAB) in Brazil, as the studies found barely mention any data collection in any part of the Central-West Region of Brazil. Investigations describing this highly complex scenario are needed, in which the elderly person comments on moments of violence experienced in everyday family and community life.

This present study aimed to present the sociodemographic profile of elderly people and to identify the situations of physical, psychological, sexual, abandonment, negligence, financial abuse, and self-negligence types of violence in the MAB.

METHOD

This is a transversal study, based on a target population, which has adopted an observational-descriptive approach. It is built upon a sample of convenience of elderly people living in the Metropolitan Area of the city of Brasília (MAB), interviewed between July 2012 and May 2013.

As the study scenario, this research used a primary care health unit which offers specific ward service for the provision of the general health needs of elderly people in MAB. The professionals who provided the caring procedures were physicians or nurses who specialized in care of the elderly.

The sample was composed of elderly people who met the following criteria of inclusion: from either sexes, age of 60 years or older, frequent users of the ward service chosen to be part of this research's scenario, no diagnosis of dementia, and agreeing to participate in this study. The condition of not have suffered any previous violent outburst against the individual was not considered a criterion for exclusion, as this question was approached during the interview, and later analyzed in terms of whether or not the elderly person had experienced a mistreating situation.

The elderly people were approached and invited to participate in this research after their medical consultation. They were conducted individually by one nurse researcher to a private room or office that had been made available, and were guaranteed the right to privacy during the research. They were then actively asked about the goals of this study.

The instrument for data collection was a questionnaire composed of semi-structured questions, validated by an expert group in the area of gerontology with different backgrounds (such as nurses, social workers and physicians), chosen by the researchers as professionals who were directly involved in the care of the elderly in the Federal District of Brazil.

The questionnaire was composed of 26 questions, 16 of which related to sociodemographic conditions and other personal information, and the other 10 being about the nature of the violent experiences of the elderly, whate-ver the type (psychological, physical, sexual, abandonment, negligence, financial abuse, or self-negligence).

To analyse the information gathered, descriptive statistics was used in terms of the variables involved, the values taking the form of arithmetic averages, and absolute and percentage frequency. A data bank was built involving categorization and the transcription of data recorded in codes into a guide, and an electronic spreadsheet, using Microsoft Excel software.

This research project was submitted for the approval of the Committee of Ethics in Research of the Health Sciences Education and Research

Foundation (FEPECS, in Portuguese), and was approved under protocol 160/2012, in June 04, 2012.

RESULTS

The sample was composed of 131 elderly people. The age average was 70-92 years old, with an interval from 61 to 87 years old, with a higher concentration of 60 to 70 year olds – representing 51.14% of the elderly people interviewed (Table 1).

With regard to gender, the majority were women (68.7%). Their self-declared ethnicity was mulatto (41.2%), followed by white (38.8%). Their place of origin before arriving in MAB was mostly from the Northeast Region of Brazil (71%). With regard to marital status, 41.98% were married, and 33.60% were widow(er)s (Table 1).

The educational level indicated that 50.38% were illiterate, and 36.6% had not finished Middle School. The majority of the elders declared that they lived with at least one relative (90%) and had children (94.6%).

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristicsand the context of the interviewed elderpeople, Metropolitan Region of Brasília, Brazil,2013 (n=131)

Gender	Ν	%
Female	90	68,7
Male	41	31,3
Age Groups		
60 円 70	67	51,14
71 円 80	50	38,16
81 円 90	14	10,7
Ethnicity		
Mulatto	54	41,22
White	51	38,8
Black	26	20
Region of Origin		
Northeast	93	71
North	3	2,3
Center-West	13	9,9
Southwest	21	16
South	1	0,8
Marital Status		

Married 55 41,98 Widow(er) 44 33,6 Single 14 10,7 Divorced 12 9,15 Living with the partner 6 4,58 Education								
Single 14 10,7 Divorced 12 9,15 Living with the partner 6 4,58 Education Illiterate 66 50,38 Incomplete Middle School 48 36,64 Finished High School 7 5,34 Finished Middle School 6 4,58 Undergraduate 3 2,29 Undergraduate Drop-out 1 0,76 Who lives with the elder 118 90 Alone 13 10 Have children 124 94,65 No 7 5,35 Income 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social group	Married	55	41,98					
Divorced 12 9,15 Living with the partner 6 4,58 Education	Widow(er)	44	33,6					
Living with the partner 6 4,58 Education	Single	14	10,7					
Education Illiterate 66 50,38 Incomplete Middle School 48 36,64 Finished High School 7 5,34 Finished Middle School 6 4,58 Undergraduate Drop-out 1 0,76 Who lives with the elder 1 0,76 At least one relative 118 90 Alone 13 10 Have children 7 5,35 No 7 5,35 Income 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember 18 36,64 from 4 to 10 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income	Divorced	12	9,15					
Illiterate 66 50,38 Incomplete Middle School 48 36,64 Finished High School 7 5,34 Finished Middle School 6 4,58 Undergraduate 3 2,29 Undergraduate Drop-out 1 0,76 Who lives with the elder 1 0,76 At least one relative 118 90 Alone 13 10 Have children 7 5,35 Income 7 5,35 Retired 66 50,38 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember Income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 <t< td=""><td>Living with the partner</td><td>6</td><td>4,58</td></t<>	Living with the partner	6	4,58					
Incomplete Middle School 48 36,64 Finished High School 7 5,34 Finished Middle School 6 4,58 Undergraduate 3 2,29 Undergraduate Drop-out 1 0,76 Who lives with the elder 1 0,76 At least one relative 118 90 Alone 13 10 Have children 7 5,35 Income 7 5,35 Retired 66 50,38 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember Income 13 3,05 Income level Income 5 4,58 No income 13 3,05 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 <td>Education</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Education							
Finished High School 7 5,34 Finished Middle School 6 4,58 Undergraduate 3 2,29 Undergraduate Drop-out 1 0,76 Who lives with the elder 118 90 Alone 13 10 Have children 13 10 Yes 124 94,65 No 7 5,35 Income 7 5,35 Retired 66 50,38 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember Income level Income From 1 to 3 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 <	Illiterate	66	50,38					
Finished Middle School 6 4,58 Undergraduate Drop-out 1 0,76 Who lives with the elder 118 90 Alone 13 10 Have children 13 10 Yes 124 94,65 No 7 5,35 Income 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember 13 3,05 Income level 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups 1 0,76 No 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion 20 22,14 Protestant 50 38,17 <td>Incomplete Middle School</td> <td>48</td> <td>36,64</td>	Incomplete Middle School	48	36,64					
Undergraduate 3 2,29 Undergraduate Drop-out 1 0,76 Who lives with the elder At least one relative 118 90 Alone 13 10 Have children Yes 124 94,65 No 7 5,35 Income 7 5,35 State Stat State State	Finished High School	7	5,34					
Undergraduate Drop-out 1 0,76 Who lives with the elder 118 90 Alone 13 10 Have children 13 10 Yes 124 94,65 No 7 5,35 Income 66 50,38 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember 11 0,76 Income level 11 0,76 From 1 to 3 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups 2 2,29 <	Finished Middle School	6	4,58					
Who lives with the elder At least one relative 118 90 Alone 13 10 Have children 124 94,65 No 7 5,35 Income 7 5,35 Retired 66 50,38 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember Income level Income level From 1 to 3 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups No 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion <td>Undergraduate</td> <td>3</td> <td>2,29</td>	Undergraduate	3	2,29					
At least one relative 118 90 Alone 13 10 Have children 124 94,65 No 7 5,35 Income 66 50,38 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember 18 36,64 from 1 to 3 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion 2 29 Roman Catholic 77 58,78 Protestant 50 38,17	Undergraduate Drop-out	1	0,76					
Alone 13 10 Have children 124 94,65 No 7 5,35 Income 7 5,35 Income 66 50,38 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember 1 0,76 From 1 to 3 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion 77 58,78 Roman Catholic 77 58,78 Protestant 50 38,17								
Have children Yes 124 94,65 No 7 5,35 Income 7 5,35 Retired 66 50,38 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember Income level 18 36,64 from 1 to 3 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups No 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion Roman Catholic 77 58,78 Protestant	At least one relative	118	90					
Yes 124 94,65 No 7 5,35 Income 7 5,35 Retired 66 50,38 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember Income level 5 From 1 to 3 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 18 36,64 from 4 to 10 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion 2 29 Roman Catholic 77 58,78 Prote	Alone	13	10					
No 7 5,35 Income Retired 66 50,38 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember Income level Income level From 1 to 3 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups Income 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion 29 22,14 Present Religion 77 58,78 Protestant 50 38,17	Have children							
Income Retired 66 50,38 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember Income level 18 36,64 From 1 to 3 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups No 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion 29 22,14 Protestant 50 38,17	Yes	124	94,65					
Retired 66 50,38 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember Income level 5 From 1 to 3 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion 77 58,78 Protestant 50 38,17	No	7	5,35					
Housewife 18 13,74 Housewife 18 13,74 Working at the moment 16 12,21 Pension from diceased partner 15 11,45 Government support 13 9,92 Retired and pension 2 1,53 Denial/does not know/does not 1 0,76 remember 1 0,76 Income level 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups 1 0,76 No 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion 77 58,78 Protestant 50 38,17	Income							
Working at the moment1612,21Pension from diceased partner1511,45Government support139,92Retired and pension21,53Denial/does not know/does not10,76remember10,76Income levelFrom 1 to 3 minimum wage units6652,67Up to 1 minimum wage units154,58No income133,05Cannot specify/no specific income22,29Denial10,76Participation in social groups10277,86Yes2922,14Present Religion7758,78Protestant5038,17	Retired	66	50,38					
Pension from diceased partner1511,45Government support139,92Retired and pension21,53Denial/does not know/does not10,76remember10,76Income levelFrom 1 to 3 minimum wage units6652,67Up to 1 minimum wage units6652,67Up to 1 minimum wage units154,58No income133,05Cannot specify/no specific income22,29Denial10,76Participation in social groups10277,86Yes2922,14Present Religion7758,78Protestant5038,17	Housewife	18	13,74					
Government support139,92Retired and pension21,53Denial/does not know/does not10,76remember10,76Income levelFrom 1 to 3 minimum wage units6652,67Up to 1 minimum wage units1836,64from 4 to 10 minimum wage units154,58No income133,05Cannot specify/no specific income22,29Denial10,76Participation in social groupsNoNo10277,86Yes2922,14Present Religion7758,78Protestant5038,17	Working at the moment	16	12,21					
Retired and pension21,53Denial/does not know/does not10,76remember10,76Income levelFrom 1 to 3 minimum wage units6652,67Up to 1 minimum wage units1836,64from 4 to 10 minimum wage units154,58No income133,05Cannot specify/no specific income22,29Denial10,76Participation in social groups10277,86Yes2922,14Present Religion7758,78Protestant5038,17	Pension from diceased partner	15	11,45					
Denial/does not know/does not10,76rememberIncome levelFrom 1 to 3 minimum wage units6652,67Up to 1 minimum wage units1836,64from 4 to 10 minimum wage units154,58No income133,05Cannot specify/no specific income22,29Denial10,76Participation in social groups10277,86Yes2922,14Present Religion7758,78Protestant5038,17	Government support	13	9,92					
rememberIncome levelFrom 1 to 3 minimum wage units6652,67Up to 1 minimum wage units1836,64from 4 to 10 minimum wage units154,58No income133,05Cannot specify/no specific income22,29Denial10,76Participation in social groupsNo10277,86Yes2922,14Present Religion7758,78Protestant5038,17	Retired and pension	2	1,53					
Income levelFrom 1 to 3 minimum wage units6652,67Up to 1 minimum wage unit1836,64from 4 to 10 minimum wage units154,58No income133,05Cannot specify/no specific income22,29Denial10,76Participation in social groups10277,86Yes2922,14Present Religion7758,78Protestant5038,17	Denial/does not know/does not	1	0,76					
From 1 to 3 minimum wage units 66 52,67 Up to 1 minimum wage unit 18 36,64 from 4 to 10 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion 77 58,78 Protestant 50 38,17	remember							
Up to 1 minimum wage unit 18 36,64 from 4 to 10 minimum wage units 15 4,58 No income 13 3,05 Cannot specify/no specific income 2 2,29 Denial 1 0,76 Participation in social groups 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion 77 58,78 Protestant 50 38,17	Income level							
from 4 to 10 minimum wage units154,58No income133,05Cannot specify/no specific income22,29Denial10,76Participation in social groupsNo10277,86Yes2922,14Present Religion7758,78Protestant5038,17	From 1 to 3 minimum wage units	66	52,67					
No income133,05Cannot specify/no specific income22,29Denial10,76Participation in social groups10277,86Yes2922,14Present Religion7758,78Protestant5038,17	Up to 1 minimum wage unit	18	36,64					
Cannot specify/no specific income22,29Denial10,76Participation in social groupsNo10277,86Yes2922,14Present ReligionRoman Catholic7758,78Protestant5038,17	from 4 to 10 minimum wage units	15	4,58					
Denial10,76Participation in social groupsNo10277,86Yes2922,14Present ReligionRoman Catholic7758,78Protestant5038,17	No income	13	3,05					
Participation in social groupsNo10277,86Yes2922,14Present Religion7758,78Protestant5038,17	Cannot specify/no specific income	2	2,29					
No 102 77,86 Yes 29 22,14 Present Religion 77 58,78 Protestant 50 38,17	Denial	1	0,76					
Yes2922,14Present Religion7758,78Protestant5038,17	Participation in social groups							
Yes2922,14Present Religion7758,78Protestant5038,17	No	102	77,86					
Present ReligionRoman Catholic7758,78Protestant5038,17	Yes	29						
Roman Catholic7758,78Protestant5038,17								
	_	77	58,78					
	Protestant	50	38,17					
	Spiritualist	4	3,05					
Total 131 100		131						
101ai 131 100		151						

Their present occupation is defined as retired in 50.4% of the cases, and in the same proportion, the individuals declared their income to be between one to three minimum wage units. Participation in groups for the elderly or in leisure activities was mentioned by only 22%. Their present religion is Roman Catholic for 59% of the participants (Table 1). Other relevant information was the presence of health issues: the majority (95.4%) mentioned at least one concern, of which the most prevailing were systemic arterial hypertension (80.15%), diabetes mellitus (29%) and osteoporosis (23%). With regard to health treatment, 92.3% confirmed they were under some type of medication treatment, with 90.8% using at least one form of medication continuously, with the support of the healthcare services located close to where they lived.

Self-declared violence cases, in a global evaluation of the sample, were present in 72.5% of the cases, suffering at least one type of aggression after they had reached the age of 60 years.

Table 2. Distribution of elders, according to the nature of the violence experienced. Metropolitan Region of Brasília, Brazil, 2013 (n=131).

Female		Male		Total					
	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%			
Psychological Violence - Humiliation									
Yes	33	25,2	12	9,15	45	34,35			
No	57	43,52	29	22,13	86	65,65			
Psycologic	Psycological Violence - Discrimination								
Yes	29	22,13	5	3,82	34	25,95			
No	61	46,56	36	27,48	97	74,05			
Physical Vi	olene	ce							
Yes	12	9,16	3	2,29	15	11,45			
No	78	59,54	38	29,01	116	88,55			
Sexual Vio	Sexual Violence								
Yes	3	2,29	4	3,05	7	5,34			
No	87	66,41	37	28,24	124	94,66			
Abadonme	ent								
Yes	25	19,08	9	6,87	34	25,95			
No	65	49,62	32	24,43	97	74,05			
Negligence	e								
Yes	17	12,98	5	3,82	22	16,79			
No	73	55,73	36	27,48	109	83,21			
Financial Abuse									
Yes	22	16,79	9	6,87	31	23,66			
No	68	51,91	32	24,43	100	76,34			
Self-Negligence									
Yes	15	11,45	5	3,82	20	15,27			
No	75	57,25	36	27,48	111	84,73			
Total	90		41		131				

Faustino AM, Moura LBA, Gandolfi L. Sociodemographic profiles and violent events experienced by the elderly: a descriptive study . Online braz j nurs [internet] 2014 Sep [cited year month day]; 13(4):529-36. Available from: http://www.objnursing. uff.br/index.php/nursing/article/view/4588

Analyzing the gender, 28.42% of the elderly who had suffered mistreatment episodes were male, and 71.58% were female. This demonstrates the assimetrics of gender influence in these cases of violence (Table 2).

In terms of psychological violence, 34% of the elders interviewed were victims of moments of humiliation, swearing, threats, and shouting, both in public and at home; with regard this type of violence, women were the ones who suffered them the most. Discrimination in terms of being elderly was reported by 26%, and it was mostly mentioned by women (Table 2).

With regard to physical violence, 11.4% described, in their testimonies, that they had suffered punches, slaps, shoves, aggression related to objects being thrown in their direction, acts of hanging using objects, among others. Once more, elderly women were the most victimized in terms of this type of violence in the research sample. Sexual violence was less common (5.3%) when compared to the other types of violence. However men were the ones who reported it the most (3.05%).

Another type of abuse that was widely reported was abandonment (26%), which was observed as a feeling of solitude, or a situation in which there is a lack of support of a relative – in many cases, related to the lack of presence of their own children. Negligence was observed by 17% of the interviewees, described as the inability to maintain minimal conditions forliving, affecting the areas of nutrition, safety, and health (Table 2).

Financial abuse (23%) was described in the form of stealing in and out of the home, robbery, and financial schemes aimed at the elder. Self--negligence was experienced in terms of a lack of care for oneself, as reported by 15% of the interviewees (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

With regard to the characterization of the sample, it was observed it was mainly female, aged above 70 years, with a low level of education and income. This data matches the risk factors relating to violence, as seen in Brazilian and other international studies, which considers that the profile of the elderly who suffer from violence is female, single/widow/ above 75 years of age, and with a low level of education^(1,5,6).

Some studies performed with the elderly demonstrate that there is a significant increase in the prevalence of noncommunicable chronic diseases during the process of population aging. It is estimated that 85% of elderly people in Brazil present at least one chronic disease, 10% of them being with concomitant infections, as also seen in the sample studied^(6,7,8,9).

The phenomenon of feminization of the aging process, and the interface of sociodemographic elements that can be associated with the sex, class, ethinicity, or age stereotypes was demonstrated through the information gathered, and supports some other studies. This means that elderly women should be considered to be a high risk group that may be in danger of many sorts of violence or abuse, in the future ^(9,10,11).

In a study regarding episodes of violence, with a sample of more than 5,000 elderly people in South Carolina, USA, interviewed over the telephone, moments of mistreatment of a psychological nature were observed in 12.9% of the studied population, being characterized by verbal aggresions such as as swearing and humiliation⁽¹²⁾. In Brazil, a survey conducted with the use of the Federal District Civil Police database, demonstrated a high level of psychological mistreatment events among the elderly who registered their complaints, in a rate of 55%⁽¹³⁾.

Negligence and self-negligence can be associated with other factors such as inadequate support services, with inefficient protection networks, and lack of articulation among these services; lack of ability to self-care and self-protection; or even extrinsic issues such as poverty or lack of social support⁽¹⁴⁾.

Another characteristic highlighted in the studied population is the phenomenon of coresidence or, in other words, living with another member of the family. Few individuals live by themselves. This can be due to a possible situation of financial dependency of the relative, or the opposite, when the elder is the financial dependent of a family member⁽¹⁵⁾. Such circumstances are related to the financial abuse reported in the interviews of this research.

The increasing number of elderly people in Brazil who experience violent situations, both in and out the home, demonstrates the need to have professionals in gerontology – especially nursing staff - prepared to develop their abilities, among many, in terms of a more skilled listening approach and the capacity to deal with the process of aging. These professionals also need to recognize and work upon the early signs of the risk factors related to violence against the elderly during the application of nursing processes, and they also need to use all available social equipment in their area of work^(16,17,18).

CONCLUSION

534

The profile of elderly individuals who are victims of violence in the area studied is that of a relatively young person, female, living with a relative (especially the spouse or children), with low levels of education and income, retired, professing the Roman Catholic faith, and who has faced psychological violence outbursts after the age of 60.

However, there is a pressing need to organize family and social support networks that enable the insertion of the elderly into a broader community, supporting the conections among generations, and the development of a culture of valorization of the experience of life of the elderly, through the incentive and the construction of situations in which the elderly are recognized and are the protagonists of their own choices.

The articulation of the care practices associated with the promotion of health, as well as the identification of suspect cases, must be part of the working process of nurses who support the elderly; this can contribute to a discussion of the opportunity to build care protocols articulated with the protection against violence network, as part of the healthcare system for the elderly.

REFERENCES

- Acierno R, Hernandez MA, Amstadter AB, Resnick HS, Steve K, Muzzy W, Kilpatrick DG. Prevalence and Correlates of Emotional, Physical, Sexual, and Financial Abuse and Potential Neglect in the United States: The National Elder Mistreatment Study. American Journal of Public Health. 2010. [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 100:292–7. Available from: http://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/ pdf/10.2105/AJPH.2009.163089. doi: 10.2105/ AJPH.2009.163089.
- Souza ER, Minayo MCS. Inserção do tema violência contra a pessoa idosa nas políticas públicas de atenção à saúde no Brasil.Ciênc. saúde coletiva. 2010. [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 15(6):2659-2668. Available from: http://www.scielo.br/ scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1413--81232010000600002&Ing=en. doi: http:// dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1413-81232010000600002.
- Cooper C, Selwood A, Blanchard M, Walker Z, Blizard R, Livingston G. Abuse of people with dementia by family carers: representative cross sectional survey. BMJ. 2009. [Cited 2014 Oct 20] 22;338:b155. Available from: http://www.bmj. com/content/338/bmj.b155.pdf%2Bhtml. doi: 10.1136/bmj.b155.

- Cooper C, Selwood A, Livingston G. The prevalence of elder abuse and neglect: a systematic review. Age Ageing. 2008. [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 37:151-60. Available from: http://ageing.oxfordjournals.org/content/37/2/151.full.pdf+html. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afm194.
- Hildreth CJ, Burke AE, Golub RM. Elder abuse. JAMA. 2011. [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 306 (5): 568. Available from: http://jama.jamanetwork.com/ article.aspx?articleid=1104180. doi:10.1001/ jama.306.5.568.
- Castro AP, Guilam MCR, Sousa ESS, Marcondes WB. Violência na velhice: abordagens em periódicos nacionais indexados. Ciênc. saúde coletiva. 2013. [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 18 (5): 1283-1292. Available from: http://www.scielo. br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1413--81232013000500013&lng=en. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1413-81232013000500013.
- Sousa DJ, White HJ, Soares LM, Nicolosi GT, Cintra FA, Delboux MJ. Maus-tratos contra idosos: atualização dos estudos brasileiros. Rev. Bras. Geriatr. Gerontol. 2010. [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 13(2):321-328. Available from: http://revista.unati.uerj. br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1809--98232010000200016&lng=pt.
- Sanches APRA, Lebrão ML, Duarte YAO. Violência contra idosos: uma questão nova? Saude soc. 2008 [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 17(3):90-100. Available from: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_ arttext&pid=S0104-12902008000300010&lng =en&nrm=iso. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/ S0104-12902008000300010.
- Abath MB, Leal MCC, Melo Filho DA. Fatores associados à violência doméstica contra a pessoa idosa. Rev. bras. geriatr. gerontol. 2012 [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 15(2): 305-314. Available from: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1809-98232012000200013&lng=en. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1809-98232012000200013.
- Santos MIPO, Griep RH. [Functional capacity of the elderly attended in a Unified Health System (SUS) program in Belém in the State of Pará]. Ciênc. saúde coletiva [Internet]. 2013 [Cited 2014 Oct 25] ; 18(3): 753-761. Available from: http://www.scielosp.org/

scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1413--81232013000800021&lng=en.

- Kuchemann BA. [Envelhecimento populacional, cuidado e cidadania: velhos dilemas e novos desafios]. Soc. estado. [Internet]. 2012. [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 27 (1): 165-80. Available from: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_ arttext&pid=S0102-69922012000100010&Ing= en&nrm=iso.
- Amstadter AB, Zajac K, Strachan M, Hernandez MA, Kilpatrick DG, Acierno R. Prevalence and correlates of elder mistreatment in South Carolina: the South Carolina elder mistreatment study. Interpers Violence. 2011. [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 26(15):2947-72. Available from: http:// jiv.sagepub.com/content/26/15/2947. doi: 10.1177/0886260510390959
- Oliveira MLC, Gomes ACG, Amaral CPM, Santos LB. Características dos idosos vítimas de violência doméstica no Distrito Federal. Rev. bras. geriatr. gerontol. 2012. [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 3(15):555-566. Available from: http://www.scielo. br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1809--98232012000300016&lng=en. http://dx.doi. org/10.1590/S1809-98232012000300016.
- 14. Ananda B. Amstadter, Josh M. Cisler, Jenna L. Mc-Cauley, Melba A. Hernandez, Wendy Muzzy, Ron Acierno. Do Incident and Perpetrator Characteristics of Elder Mistreatment Differ by Gender of the Victim? Results from the National Elder Mistreatment Study. J Elder Abuse Negl. 2011[Cited 2014 Oct 20]; 23(1): 43–57. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/ PMC4017657/?report=reader
- 15. Beach SR, Schulz R, Castle NG, Rosen J. Financial exploitation and psychological mistreatment among older adults: differences between African Americans and non-African Americans in a population-based survey. Gerontologist. 2010 [Cited 2014 Oct 20]; 50(6):744-57. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/ PMC3003550/
- Salcedo-Barrientos DM, Gonçalves L, Oliveira Junior M, Egry EY. Violência doméstica e enfermagem: da percepção do fenômeno à realidade cotidiana. av.enferm. [serial on the Internet]. 2011 Dec [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 29(2): 353-362. Available from: http://www.scielo.

org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0121--45002011000200014&lng=en.

- Gaioli CCLO, Rodrigues RAP. Occurrence of domestic elder abuse. Rev. Latino-Am. Enfermagem. 2008. [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 16(3): 465-470. Available from: http://www.scielo. br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0104--11692008000300021&lng=en. http://dx.doi. org/10.1590/S0104-11692008000300021.
- Moura LBA, Reis PED, Faustino AM, Guilhem D, Bampi LNS, Martins G. Vivências de Violência Experimentadas por Mulheres do Distrito Federal: Estudo Descritivo. Online braz j nurs. 2011. [Cited 2014 Oct 25]; 10 (3). Available from: http://www. objnursing.uff.br/index.php/nursing/article/ view/3534. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.5935/1676-4285.20113534.

All authors participated in the phases of this publication in one or more of the following steps, in According to the recommendations of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE, 2013); (a) substantial involvement in the planning or preparation of the manuscript or in the collection, analysis or interpretation of data; (b) preparation of the manuscript or conducting critical revision of intellectual content; (c) approval of the versión submitted of this manuscript. All authors declare for the appropriate purposes that the responsibilities related to all aspects of the manuscript submitted to OBJN are yours. They ensure that issues related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the article were properly investigated and resolved. Therefore, they exempt the OBJN of any participation whatsoever in any imbroglios concerning the content under consideration. All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest of financial or personal nature concerning this manuscript which may influence the writing and/or interpretation of the findings. This statement has been digitally signed by all authors as recommended by the ICMJE, whose model is available in http://www. objnursing.uff.br/normas/DUDE_eng_13-06-2013.pdf

Received: 10/24/2013 **Revised:** 10/13/2014 **Approved:** 10/20/2014