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The Medical Sociologists’ Contribution to the Interdisciplinary Geriatric Assessment Unit: A Sociology “With” Medicine*

Jeffrey Michael Clair, University of Alabama at Birmingham

ABSTRACT

Observations are drawn from field experience to explicate the role of the medical sociologist within geriatric clinical practice—a case presentation of a sociology “with” medicine. A sociology "with" medicine is presented as promoting the institutionalization of medical sociology as a special field within, yet independent of, medicine. The aim is to promote initiatives which generate and test social theory while expanding collaboration with medical clinicians, researchers, and educators to maximize the application of social scientific data to patient care. The goals of specialized geriatric practice are then described. Next, the substantive functions and activities of the medical sociologist in a geriatric team practice are identified. Finally, the potential problems faced by medical sociologists in gaining legitimacy in clinical practice are discussed.
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Although medical sociology has produced a convincing body of basic and applied data relevant to understanding health services and illness, medical sociologists often feel disregarded because there is no one-to-one relationship between the discovery of new knowledge and its clinical application (Mechanic and Aiken, 1986:2). The theoretical and methodological contributions of medical sociology to patient care are not well understood by many medical administrators, researchers, educators, and practitioners (Niklas, 1982). Much of our social knowledge is thought to be too abstract and dubious to be helpful to medical practice in a meaningful way (Light, 1992). Sociological insights and data periodically inform medical practitioners' views of a problem, but more often, applicable findings are periphery to medical practice.

Currently, a growing body of health care providers are noticing the extent to which their success with patients is affected by social psychological factors ordinarily seen as outside of their area of professional expertise (Mechanic and Aiken, 1986). Many physicians, for example, now recognize that their medical decision making does not just flow from a routine, scientific calculus, but rather is done by considering patients' social roles, values, and particular social settings and resources (Levine, 1987). Few, if any patient care decisions are purely medical (Zola, 1991).

Geriatric assessment team practices have proven to be amenable to the consideration of social science data for addressing medical practice concerns. Many geriatric clinics have developed on the basis of an interdisciplinary exchange of ideas. Geriatric team members have a growing awareness of the relevance of the social contexts of their patients' interpersonal behavior, social networks, and economic circumstances (Levine and Freeman, 1989; Waitzkin, 1991). These interdisciplinary settings are ideal for demonstrating and implementing the contributions of the medical sociologist to patient care decision making.

The purpose of this article is, first, to explicate the role of the medical sociologist within geriatric clinical practice—a case presentation of a sociology "with" medicine (Levine, 1987). Then, the goals of specialized geriatric practice are described. Next, the substantive functions and activities of the medical sociologist in a geriatric team practice are identified. Finally, the potential problems faced by medical sociologists in gaining legitimacy in clinical practice are discussed.

Observations are drawn from field experiences. Although the functions of the medical sociologist described below should be applicable to many medical contexts, examples from practice in an interdisciplinary geriatric assessment outpatient clinic best illustrate the goodness of fit between patient care and the practice of sociology within medicine.
Toward a Sociology "With" Medicine

As the aging population continues to grow, health care administrators are recognizing the need for expert practitioners in the field of aging. The increase in the proportion of frail elderly raises a number of important sociomedical questions regarding the motivations, satisfaction, and coping abilities of older people, their social networks, their caregivers, and the appropriate responses to their needs (Freeman and Levine, 1989). Through a focus on the multidimensionality of health, illness, and humane patient care practice, the medical sociologist can contribute to the medical care needs of the elderly while generating critical data for testing basic sociological theory. This multidimensional practice focus is not well established. However, the appropriate contribution of the medical sociological practitioner is still unfolding.

During the early development of medical sociology in the United States, it was common to differentiate between sociology "in" medicine and the sociology "of" medicine (Straus, 1957). The question of the appropriate relationship between sociology and medicine persists today. The relationship began with sociology providing information solicited from the medical profession. Sociology "in" medicine is the title given to research structured to serve medical interests. From this perspective, emphasis is on chronic diseases and their impact on mortality; mental illness; benefits derived from technological advances and therapy; and, more recently, on disease prevention (Susser, Watson, and Hooper, 1985). This type of work usually stresses research design and data collection while addressing issues of practical concern identified by the client. Within the discipline of sociology, sociologists engaged "in medicine" often raise the suspicion of colleagues who feel that such purely applied activity lacks theoretical substance and development (Freeman and Levine, 1989).

Critics of sociology "in" medicine prefer to view medicine as a source of data for generating and answering sociological, rather than medical, questions. They see the sociology "of" medicine as concerned with using medicine as an arena to study important social processes, such as stratification, organization, control, professional socialization, and policy. In other words, the sociologist chooses to make the medical arena the dependent variable so as to contribute to the formulation and reformulation of theory. Although there is often no particular concern, in this type of research, about developing insights applicable to medical practitioners, this is considered an appropriate sociological pursuit. The one major distinction between the sociology "in" and "of" medicine is whether the sociologist
works with a medical definition of problems or with sociological definitions (Larson, 1990; Wardwell, 1982).

Within the last ten years, it has become increasingly popular to view the practice of medicine more holistically. Many sociologists are advocating a broad sociology “of health” rather than a narrow sociology “of medicine” (Conrad, 1990; Twaddle, 1982). The sociology of health is studied as a multidimensional concept, including physical, social psychological, emotional, and even spiritual aspects of subjective experience. The focus of research extends to all social structures that affect subjective experience, including family, industry, education, and the environment (Wallace, 1990). In terms of an “of health” perspective, the term “medical sociology” connotes a more bounded field, implying a focus on institutionalized structure, including occupations, special functions, certain organizations, power relationships, and structured interactions. Advocates of an “of health” perspective argue that they are not restricted to models viewing health and health care as a function of the medical care system and practitioners.

These seemingly disparate parts of the sociology-medicine-health relationship are actually more unified than sometimes portrayed. This is, in part, because medical sociologists have become more applied. We have learned that “the interplay between theory and practice improves both” (Mechanic and Aiken, 1986:3). Clinical studies of practical problems sharpen theoretical thinking and bring it closer to reality; good theory suggests dimensions of applied problems that enrich investigative comprehension (Clark, et al., 1989; Larson, 1990). The different dimensions of medical sociology have advanced one other. We are no longer just concerned with what medicine does “to” its patients but rather with what it does “with” them (Zola, 1991:11). Practicing medical sociology equates what sociologists do “with” medicine and equates medicine “with” health care (Zola, 1991:12).

A sociology “with” medicine encompasses the various factional components of medical sociology described above. A sociology “with” medicine promotes two separate but related ideas (Bloom, 1990:7): (1) the institutionalization of medical sociology as a special field independent of medicine is both advantageous and necessary for maintaining the integrity of the sociologists’ initiative; and (2) the continuation and expansion of collaboration with medical educators, clinicians, and researchers is vital for the effective application of social scientific data to medicine in action, or patient care.

This approach illustrates the importance of the independent pursuit of research utilizing the medical system and practitioners to generate and test sociological theory. Furthermore, the sociologist practicing “with-in” a medical context also serves a variety of broad medical interests and works
toward developing specific insights applicable to medical practice. Incorporating processes that bring patient subjective experience into our research agendas insures that sociological practitioners continually gather pertinent data that maintain the independent interests of social and medical scientists. The medical sociologist working "with-in" medicine combines the pure/basic and applied aspects of sociology—at once attending to both concerns with knowledge production and hypothesis testing, and problem solving using available generated information (Larson, 1990). In this sense, the interests of sociology and medicine become inextricably intertwined.

To a certain extent, the movement toward a sociology "with" medicine is enhanced by a broad shift in interest, validating the study of linkages between social and medical contexts. A shift to an integrated social-medical-health emphasis is evidenced by macro level changes already taking place, from a preoccupation with improved health care access and utilization to a recognition that the costs of medical care must be faced. Health care cost inflation is perpetuated by the demographic trend of an aging population seeking and receiving medical care (Fox, 1985). Because of concerns about costs, medical practitioners, researchers, educators, and administrators must develop a broader view of health care and quality of life. Quality of life is an increasingly popular goal of medical care involving older patients (Pearlman and Uhlman, 1991). Freeman and Levine (1989:4) suggest that the "distance that medicine and medical sociology have traveled is evident now in the emergence of quality of life as an overriding social dimension of judging health and illness...."

Geriatric Patient Care

Social, behavioral, and medical practitioners now realize that living beyond the years of functional independence results in compromised health and social well-being (Brody, 1989), or "dysquality" (Weiss, 1985). Current multidisciplinary dialogue pays increasing attention to preserving the quality of care and life (Fink et al., 1987) and achieving an ideal mix of medical care and social support (Clair, 1990a). The goal of integrated social and medical efforts should be to improve quality of life and long-term care decisions rather than simply to achieve reductions in utilization of acute and chronic services.

Interdisciplinary geriatric assessment units have been established on the premise that they are more attentive to the co-morbid nature of old age and issues concerning the quality of life and long-term care. Such clinics repre-
sent a complex array of patients with interacting physical and psychosocial functional disabilities (Clair, 1990a; Silliman, 1989). As a result, health care and service providers in many geriatric settings are becoming sympathetic to multidisciplinary perspectives. The complex nature of these clinics allows medical sociologists to oversee the implementation of social science research while enhancing patient care quality and promoting cost effectiveness.

Because of cost inflation pressures, the Health Care Financing Administration and the Physician Payment Assessment Commission appear committed to developing a payment system encouraging the growth of outpatient clinics. This commitment, along with the overall sensitivity of specialized geriatric care to functional ability, quality of life, and long-term care support, seems to ensure the continued development of such clinics.

The bulk of the current literature supports the growth of these interdisciplinary clinics by demonstrating their overall effectiveness in elderly patient care (Epstein, et al., 1990; McVey, et al., 1989; Pinholt, et al., 1987; Rubenstein, et al., 1984; Williams, 1987; Williams and Williams, 1986; Williams, et al., 1987). Research on geriatric clinics documents their superior effectiveness in: (a) diagnosing physical functioning, (b) managing medication use, (c) making better placement decisions as compared to general care facilities, and (d) lowering short-term death rates.

It is clearly not enough, however, for an interdisciplinary geriatrics assessment team to simply diagnose physical and mental disease and functional disabilities (Rubenstein, 1987). On a practical level, once a patient becomes ill and requires care, the largest challenge is not simply making the diagnosis and prescribing appropriate treatment (Mechanic and Aiken, 1986:7-9). As important as diagnosis and treatment might be a greater challenge lies ahead. Patients and family must be, motivated to accept and implement treatment strategies and life-style regimens that not only help limit incapacity and promote continued functionality, but also generate social psychological well-being. Furthermore, geriatric outpatient clinic providers must be prepared to assist family caregivers in developing the support needed to care for their often-disabled loved ones. The framework used to assess patient illness and treatment is undergoing fundamental change not only because of the escalation of medical care costs, but also because of the blurred boundaries between medicine and other sectors of social life. Major societal changes in values, life styles, household structures, and health beliefs are pressuring medical institutions to consider patient care and treatment in a holistic context.

Physician/sociologist Howard Waitzkin (1991) alerts us to the prevalence of these “social” problems within geriatric clinical settings and
encounters. When patients approach a physician for help, they represent a social context along with their physical problems. Waitzkin (1991) demonstrates that some of the most interesting features of geriatric assessment involve concerns about matters that appear peripheral to the goals of clinical medicine. When elderly patients' personal troubles arise in the intimacy of the patient-doctor relationship (e.g., isolation, financial difficulty, death of family members, adjustments to retirement), physicians often deal with these social issues by focusing on physical complaints while conspicuously failing to address a patient's underlying social psychological problems.

The documentation of social issues should, whenever possible, explain something about the patient's well-being and support networks, just as the clinical diagnosis explains something about the patient's physical symptoms. The social psychological aspects of patient care are of intrinsic concern to the medical sociologist. Drawing on this assumption and clinical experience, fundamental activities are identified through which the medical sociologist practitioner can contribute to both medical and sociological research agendas to improve patient care.

The Medical Sociologists' Contribution to Geriatric Assessment

This section will describe the multiple roles a medical sociologist can serve in a geriatric clinic setting. The practice of "sociology with medicine" presented here requires foremost that the sociologist be a researcher. Simultaneously, however, the sociologist must also play the roles of consultant and teacher. Examples of activities of substantive focus that many medical sociologists are capable of undertaking are then described. Issues of (a) clinical efficacy/patient satisfaction; (b) communication patterns; (c) compliance/adherence; and (d) roles and norms are of basic sociological research interest and, in addition, have practical implications for medical practitioners, educators, and researchers—thus meeting the basic objectives of a "sociology with medicine."

Functions

The basic objectives of geriatric assessment units are to promote healthy aging and to prevent or minimize morbidity and disability. Most of these outpatient clinics are staffed with interdisciplinary providers, including all or some of the following: board-certified general internists with specialization in geriatrics, geriatrics fellows, residents and acting interns, a clinical
nurse specialist in geriatrics, a registered nurse, a social worker, a pharmacist, an optometrist, an audiologist, a dietitian, and a clinical psychologist.

This team approach to geriatric patient care usually does not include the services of a medical sociologist, although the functions that a medical sociologist can serve in, working "with-in" geriatric assessment, are diverse. Most medical sociologists joining geriatric teams can simultaneously serve the three roles of researcher, consultant, and teacher (Lee, 1979; also see Straus, 1979, and Wirth, 1931, for similar typologies).

As a researcher, the medical sociologist brings quantitative and qualitative skills to the data available through participation in the clinic (Mechanic, 1989). Many medical sociologists have developed triangulated research skills to conduct field observations, interviews, and quantitative assessment of medical records.

There are a number of ways in which the medical sociologist can develop a research agenda that contributes to social, medical, and clinical knowledge. For instance, besides collecting basic socio-demographic data on the patient and primary caregivers, the medical sociologist can adopt a strategy that includes collection of data on variables such as depression; locus of control; social activity and support; strain; life events; complete IADL and ADL information; baseline morbidity data on hospital admissions, stays, and number of days confined to bed because of illness; and physical, social, and indicators of psychological well-being. Although much of this information seems of obvious importance, most of this data is not generally gathered, even in specialized geriatric assessment units. To further assess the larger social context of illness, the medical sociologist can conduct a post-encounter assessment of the physician-patient-caregiver interaction by interviewing the patient and caregiver while asking the doctor to answer the same Likert scale items through a questionnaire. Patients can then be followed to obtain information on adherence and health outcomes, at one- and six-month intervals, for example. Ideally, the data collected is of use to the clinic, but is also of the medical sociologist's choosing.

The sociologist's consultant role involves assisting other health care and service providers in parts of their work for which the sociologist has special knowledge. Consultive contributions are periodically requested as the medical sociologist participates in the study of cases and their treatment along with medical practitioners. This means that the medical sociologist is involved in rounds and discussion of actual cases with the interdisciplinary team.

The teaching component of the medical sociologist's role is equivalent to systematic instruction. The medical sociologist provides practical and
theoretical instruction. For instance, just as a clinical psychologist can train health care providers to recognize and intervene with senile dementia, the medical sociologist can train these providers to interact better with elderly patients and one another. In general, instruction focuses on sensitizing physicians and other health professionals to how the values of biomedicine affect the patient's life-world.

Balancing these three roles is a dynamic process that leads to the generation of hypotheses and theory building. The research-oriented medical sociologist obtains detailed information from the patient and family members, data that even similar practitioners, such as the social worker and psychologist, do not collect as part of their initial interview. The medical sociologist, by operating from a research perspective, ends up collecting data that contributes to the diagnostic work-up, benefiting health care providers, patients, and their family members.

Activities of Substantive Focus

For the medical sociologist, there are several fundamental areas of investigation that directly impact geriatric patient care while also being of basic sociological research interest. We can even go so far as to say that almost any theory, process, or phenomenon explicated in the social psychological literature has application to patient care activities. Fundamental social structural and processual concepts relevant to the medical care context include roles, norms, and communication patterns. The health care provider who understands these elemental social issues is better equipped to practice medicine.

(a) Clinical Efficacy/Satisfaction. One specific objective of the medical sociologist can be to study the clinical efficacy of a geriatrics outpatient clinic and determine whether it provides important positive impacts on patient functioning and well-being. Determining which physical and psychosocial factors hold the most promise for effective intervention and identifying those conditions that seem most problematic for outpatient interventions is important to any study of clinical efficacy. With proper training in discourse analysis, previous efficacy research can be extended by incorporating data on patient satisfaction with geriatric assessment, general health care, and provider communication style. Communication is a fundamental social psychological process. Any efficacy study should ideally include a satisfaction with communication component. Given the debilitating condition of geriatric patients, the family caregivers' experience and satisfaction with
physicians become important components to sociological research. Communication analysis is a form of methodological training not possessed by other team members, since they primarily perform diagnostic functions. Thus, the medical sociologist is ideally situated to contribute this expertise to the assessment team.

Because interdisciplinary geriatric assessment units generally include psychosocial components designed to grapple with patient social problems (Epstein, Hall, Fretwell et al., 1990; Rubenstein, Josephson, and Wieland et al., 1984), we should expect that the processing of social contextual concerns here will be different than in nonelderly specialized clinics. This concern is particularly important since many researchers have shown that psychosocial disorders are more prevalent among the elderly than among other age groups (Greene et al., 1987; Maletta, 1983).

Effective communication is important for fully managing a patient's illness and efficiently promoting health. Effectiveness of communication and attentiveness of practitioners to patient concerns appear to be the strongest predictors of how patients will evaluate care received (Cleary and McNeil, 1988). When psychosocial issues are dealt with during the medical encounter, patients are more satisfied with the visit and, ultimately, their health status will improve (Greene et al., 1987). The assumption here is that effective doctor-patient communication is at the foundation of any set of clinical efficacy standards.

(b) Direct Assessment of Communication Patterns. Buttressed by a consumer movement, a so-called "geriatrics revolution" currently confronts the practice of medicine. Elderly patients and their families are demanding more responsive care. Although many of the communication and social problems exemplified in medical encounters do not occur uniquely among the elderly, such problems will become more commonplace as demographic patterns continue to shift. The policy challenges raised by an aging society are beginning to attract some response. To what extent a critical vision will extend to the discourse of geriatric medicine remains unclear (Waitzkin, 1991).

The medical sociologist can provide evidence demonstrating the fundamental communication problems among patients and physicians and, increasingly, between physicians and caregivers, who play a vital role in geriatric medicine (Glasser, et al., 1990). The existing literature on geriatric medical encounters reflects more theoretical than empirical findings.

What doctor-patient care relationship studies indicate for patients in general is that positive outcomes are associated with a highly infor-
mative communication style and opportunities for patient and care-
giver participation in decision making. Additionally, patients want
doctors to respond favorably to their questioning and show sensitivity
to their social-psychological well-being. Whether this expansive mode
of communication—one requiring attention to the psychosocial as
well as the physical aspects of illness—can be achieved for elderly
patients remains an empirical question (Cook, Coe, and Hanson,
1990). Preliminary results suggest that physicians are less responsive
to elderly patient concerns than is desirable (Greene et al., 1987).
Despite the fact that the elderly generally have a greater number of
problems than younger patients do, physicians tend to spend less,
rather than more, time with older patients (Allman, et al., 1993).

In addition, despite the sizable literature on interactions between
patients and physicians (Mishler, 1984; Waitzkin, 1991) and the grow-
ing literature focusing on older patients and their doctors (Haug &
Ory, 1987; Greene et al., 1987), relatively few studies have gone
beyond this dyad to examine the unusually important role of family
members in the medical care of older patients (Clair, 1990b). Several
theoretical papers (Adelman, Greene, & Charon, 1987; Coe &
Prendergast, 1985; Silliman, 1989) have argued that this triadic rela-
tionship is especially critical in examining the medical care of elderly
patients. Dementia is one example of a triadic encounter where family
caregivers play an especially important role due to the patients' lim-
ited competence and the uncertainties of diagnosis, course, and man-

Because of such special issues that arise in the medical care of
geriatric patients, the study of relative satisfaction and dissatisfaction
with medical care as perceived by the family caregiver is of great
importance. This is an area in which the quality of practitioner care
has implications not only for addressing the problems of burden expe-
rienced by families, but also for assuring that caregivers appropriately
manage patients' medical care.

The potential benefits of generating research data so that successful
medical interviewing skills can be integrated into teaching curricula
are enormous. Patient satisfaction depends in part on the quality of the
medical encounter (Lipkin, et al., 1984). The accuracy and complete-
ness of the information elicited by care providers are a function of
medical interview techniques (Carter, et al., 1982). With effective
techniques, the physicians' spectrum of concerns expand (Engel,
1980). When physicians learn to focus on listening to the patient
rather than directing the patient, much new information becomes available. For instance, major, as opposed to initial, complaints can be clarified and addressed (Barsky, 1981) and psychosocial complaints and maladjustments can be put into proper context within the care process (DeVries, et al., 1982).

(c) *Compliance/Adherence.* Compliance with treatment is probably the most studied aspect of the social psychological dimension of the care process. This is because all of the knowledge and skills of the physician, as well as all of the power and resources of the medical establishment, are rendered impotent by a simple act of noncompliance, such as not taking medication (Blascovich, 1982; Kessler, 1991). The best diagnosis is worth nothing if there is a failure to follow through with treatment plans. A sociology with medicine, while focusing on compliance in terms of patients who do not adhere to physician directives, is also likely to identify ways in which the issue of compliance reflects the social control exerted by medical practitioners.

Unraveling the dynamics of labeling and the operation of stereotypes is an important aspect of research and application. Like other human beings, physicians are likely to treat patients in stereotypical ways based on the patient's age, sex, race, and occupation. We know that elderly and lower-class persons are reluctant to interrupt and ask questions during the medical encounter, which suggests that more information should be provided by the medical practitioner (Waitzkin, 1984). There is also evidence that communication difficulties exist between doctors and their geriatric patients (Beland and Maheux, 1990).

Medical practitioners should become more aware of sociolinguistic differences among age groups and social classes. Instead of labeling some patients as incompetent, practitioners should make extra efforts to increase the information they provide to these patients. With this sensitivity, treatment strategies can be used with enhanced comprehensiveness and compliance (Kimball, 1982).

How the medical record and caregivers contribute to the labeling process of patients (Clair, 1990b) is also an important concern. Does information in the medical record bias even new patient-physician interactions? Do caregivers unintentionally establish elderly patients as unreliable historians, thus undermining the patient-physician relationship? Physicians can benefit from a knowledge of statistical generalizations about categories of patients, but this knowledge should stimulate questions rather than lead to unfounded conclusions. Research findings on special populations need to be used astutely in order to benefit individual
patients. Physicians, through techniques that usually have to be taught to them, must learn to establish whether a specific patient fits the statistical pattern; to merely assume so is to stereotype.

(d) **Roles and norms.** This is the traditional focus of sociology, and is, perhaps, the most difficult and abstract information to disseminate to medical practitioners. It is important that health care providers understand that while each medical interaction has a degree of spontaneity, the rules governing the procedures and content of interactions are largely constrained by prior expectations (Clair, 1990b). In addition to a biomedical domain, there is a system of values and norms that structure and guide interactions and that enjoy some continuity over time and from place to place (Strauss, et al., 1985). One consistent assumption is that the physician will control the course of action and that the patient will be in a dependent position. One might say that they have an investment in the patient role, since full attention rests upon the ability to perform this role well.

The general form of role relationships is highly structured from the point of view of health care and service providers, who deal with sick patients during their normal job activities. Recent research suggests that physicians also bring established attitudes to their interactions with elderly patients (Beland and Maheux, 1990). From the patient and caregiver perspective, however, role relationships and expectations often seem to be freshly invented and to lack a history (Clair, 1990b). Interaction, for providers, is highly structured, with few surprises. Interaction for patients and caregivers, on the other hand, unfolds with more anticipation. This perpetuates physician control and patient and caregiver dependence. The pervasiveness of habituated experience during medical encounters suggests that instances of autonomy and innovation are rarities for patients and their caregivers.

Medical sociologists may bring behavioral tendencies to the physician's attention and encourage the physician to take the role of the patient and caregiver and try to role-play the interaction. Role-taking is certainly acknowledged as a basic process in most interactionist treatments of social life (see Hewitt, 1991; Kearl and Gordon, 1992). Similarly, physicians can encourage their geriatric patients and caregivers to share their self-diagnoses with them. Such role-taking between status unequals may have limited technical effectiveness, but such efforts will be likely to reduce the social distance between interactants by encouraging the patient and caregiver to participate more fully in the health care process (Schwalbe, 1986).
Discussion

As medical sociologists, we are continually challenged to generate distinctive and useful contributions to our discipline. There is a growing expectation from within our own discipline, and also from other disciplines, that our findings should also benefit medical practice (Colombotos, 1988). The position developed here is that our contribution is dynamic, and best accomplished by generating research questions that are field validated, uncovering valuable data through innovative methodological approaches. What is proposed here is an ideal situation, in which sociologists work "with" medical providers to apply empirical knowledge to patient care activities. There are increasing opportunities for medical sociologists to work in this capacity, especially in geriatric settings. Fortunately, the continuing development of interdisciplinary geriatric assessment units and calls for clinical research in aging involving social and behavioral scientists (Lonergan, 1991) provide sociological practitioners the opportunity to establish working ties "with" medicine, demonstrating that the promise of medical sociology can be replaced by hard evidence of its utility (Freeman and Levine, 1989).

Sociological practitioners also currently find themselves able to gain access to clinical settings through self-initiation and advocacy. As practitioners, we have not yet been fully embraced by physicians as partners in the clinical setting. Such partnership is still only possible by invitation, and many sociologists will find it difficult to gain such access, since an invitation implies that others in the medical context clearly understand the distinct contributions that a sociological perspective can provide (Bloom, 1989; Hunt and Sobal, 1990). Even interdisciplinary geriatric team members may be hesitant to welcome this new perspective, because of intrinsic differences in disciplinary thought and the potential overlap in substantive activities, generating potential displacement issues. While most sociologists will need to continue to request inclusion in clinical practice settings, eventual invitations from innovative medical leaders will help ease entry into such settings, while legitimating our body of knowledge.

The legitimation of the medical sociologist in clinical settings is important because it relieves the pressures of dual loyalties (Kleinman, 1980; Scheper-Hughes, 1990). Medical sociologists in the clinical context must often take a stance that is intrinsically divided. This is a dilemma that simultaneously requires the medical sociologist to be collegial, by expressing concern with the practical resolution of clinical problems, while at the same time remaining autonomous, by generating sociological theories of illness and care capable of withstanding disciplinary scrutiny. Although both participation
invitations and self-initiated clinical access run the risk of making the sociologist indebted to the host’s interest, they help legitimize and lend credibility to the fact that the clinically applied medical sociologist legitimately shifts between patient and practitioner perspectives, being an advocate for both. This holistic research approach allows the medical sociologist to generate data on patient care processes despite the fact that the interests and goals of doctors and their patients do not always coincide; this fact, too, is worthy of empirical attention (Allman, et al., 1993).

In general, there is a value to the medical sociologist working with medicine, to the extent that the sociological imagination and language represents another frame of reference allowing help-receivers and help-providers to construct a useful reciprocal language. Delineating how these social actors conceive and conceptualize their life worlds is a significant contribution of medical sociologists.

Proponents of varying patient care philosophies must recognize that many illnesses entering the clinic represent tragic personal experiences with the social world. The intellectual diversity of medical sociologists makes them capable of inspiring integrative efforts to knit together, empirically and conceptually, the seemingly disparate aspects of patient care. A critical medical sociology discourse asks what medicine might become if, beyond its biomedical goals and values, we begin to comprehend how unmet needs and the psychosocial stresses of everyday life can generate multiple illness symptoms within individuals. Until the psychosocial context of medical encounters is given explicit attention in research and teaching, doctors will continue to “be as mystified as their patients about the ingredients of effective medical care” (Eisenberg, 1988). Recent mandates have been put forth to try to ensure the proper development of humanistic qualities in physicians (American Board of Internal Medicine, 1991; American Medical Association, 1991).

The theory and method of the social sciences must also be integrated into the medical educational and research establishment if physicians are going to be able to respond effectively to patient illness as a human experience. We might then begin to build a basis for a truly “social” medicine and a critically applied social scientific research base, addressing the social, behavioral, political, and ethical ramifications of medicine and medical care (Schep-Hughes, 1990:194).

Placing sociological ideas “with-in” the context of clinical practice can lead to a clarification and broadening of the patient care process. The disciplines of medicine and sociology will thus be enhanced, while elderly members of society will receive more comprehensive and humane patient care.
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ABSTRACT

A review of the literature on physicians' perceptions of alcoholics and the elderly shows that scant professional or research attention has been given to the elderly alcoholic. Medical schools offer little training on alcoholism, fostering the impression that physicians do not have responsibility for treating alcoholic patients. An exploratory study of 26 physicians reaffirmed physicians' limited knowledge of, or interest in, addressing older patients' drinking problems, as assessed by physicians' responses to vignettes. These findings challenge the existing health care system, especially in light of the current demographic predictions that the proportion of the elderly population will increase substantially and the prevalence of alcohol-related problems in this age group. Strategies to address the drinking problems of the elderly are discussed.

Both the elderly and alcoholics are stigmatized groups in society: the elderly by the mere fact that they have grown old, alcoholics by their behavior, although this has diminished to some degree with greater social acceptance of the concept of alcoholism as a disease. This paper examines the stigmatization of elderly alcoholics and examines the fact that the drinking problems of the elderly receive little attention from physicians.

*The author is grateful for the assistance of William M. Holmes.
Although significant gains have been made in the last several decades to reduce alcoholism's stigma among the general public, this is less true among those who are in the helping professions. Those who have the responsibility for treating alcoholism continue to view alcoholics in a negative light (DiCicco-Bloom, et al., 1986; Brown, 1982; Murphy, 1980; Cantor, 1977; Straus, 1976; Jones and Helrich, 1972). In 1956, the American Medical Association designated alcoholism as a disease (Jellinek, 1960). This act represents one effort to bring alcoholism under the rubric of medicine. However, many physicians are still reluctant to treat alcoholics. If physicians do not consider alcoholism a disease, they can justify having no responsibility for treating patients with drinking problems.

The elderly alcoholic received almost no professional attention until the 1970s, and, since that time, professional interest has continued to be minimal. Kola, et al. (1984), in a survey of 88 social service agencies, document the lack of knowledge and concern for elderly alcoholics and their treatment needs. Nonetheless, Gurnack and Thomas (1989) depict five reasons that elderly alcoholism deserves greater public and research attention. First, the number of elderly in this country has increased and will continue to increase rapidly—numbers alone justify concern about alcohol problems later in life. Second, increasingly better educated elderly have become more willing to avail themselves of mental health services due to more positive attitudes toward psychiatric services. Third, an increase in alcohol abuse in later life is predicted because younger cohorts include more heavy drinkers and fewer who abstain from alcohol. Fourth, physicians are likely to mistake the effects of alcohol abuse in the elderly for irreversible dementia. Misdiagnosed patients may receive custodial care rather than treatment for their alcoholism. Fifth, early identification and treatment of drinking problems in the elderly would preclude expensive long-term institutionalization.

An exploratory study was undertaken to examine physicians' attitudes and treatment of elderly people with drinking problems. Physicians are in an excellent position to identify and offer treatment for patients' alcohol problems. The intent of this study was to learn more about how physicians perceive drinking problems and what types of interventions they are willing to make with elderly alcoholics. The vignettes compared the level of physician intervention offered to elderly and younger alcoholics.

Prevalence of Alcoholism Among the Elderly

Though sparse, the literature on elderly alcoholism indicates that drinking problems among the elderly are more far-reaching than is generally recognized.
The treatment literature distinguishes between the early onset and the late onset drinker (Zimberg, 1974; Finlayson et al., 1988). The early onset alcoholic, with a long history of alcoholism, has simply survived into old age. The late onset alcoholic develops drinking problems later in life, typically as a response to life factors associated with aging—retirement, loss of spouse, isolation from family and friends, medical problems, and other social factors—although risk factors are not clearly identified (Israelstam, 1988; Atkinson, 1984; Gurnack and Thomas, 1989). Early onset alcoholics comprise two-thirds of the elderly alcoholic population, while late onset alcoholics comprise one-third (Zimberg, 1978). Zimberg (1978) and Williams (1984) acknowledge the variance in estimates of the number of elderly alcoholics and the need to better identify elderly with drinking problems. In general, most research estimates the prevalence of alcoholism to be between 10 and 20 percent while only a very small proportion (1-2 percent) of older drinkers identify themselves as alcoholic. Table 1 reviews prevalence estimates of elderly alcoholism.

Graham (1986) suggests that self-report techniques may not be appropriate with the elderly, as they may have difficulty remembering recent alcohol consumption, especially if they have no job or regular schedule to help with recent memory. The elderly take more prescription drugs than any other age group, which may also impair their memory. There is also a concern about the possible interactions between alcohol and medication. In addition, the elderly may have few relatives or friends to recognize and confront them about drinking.

Table 1
Prevalence Estimates of Elderly Alcoholics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>General Population</th>
<th>Hospitalized</th>
<th>Nursing Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher-Identified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimberg (1978)</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td>&gt;10-15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blose (1978)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm (1984)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horton (1986)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15-20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis, et al. (1989)</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laforge, et al. (in press)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Identified Alcoholics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrahams and Patterson (1978)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttman (1978)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The literature clearly reveals higher objective estimates of elderly alcoholism by researchers than self-reports of drinking behavior reveal. These issues underscore the importance of physician recognition of drinking problems and willingness to offer help to the elderly with drinking problems.

Several factors, however, hinder physicians' willingness to recognize or offer help to elderly alcoholics. Among these are the negative perceptions which physicians hold of both the elderly and alcoholics.

Physicians' Perceptions of the Elderly

The stereotyping of the elderly in American society hardly needs explanation. Physicians, like the rest of society, have been socialized into this negative view, and it is no surprise that they carry these views into their practice. Coccaro and Miles (1984) found, in a review of 17 studies, that medical students, educators, and practicing physicians held indifferent or negative attitudes toward geriatric education and geriatric medical care.

Greene, et al. (1987) found that fewer psychosocial issues were raised by patients and physicians in interviews with elderly patients. Physicians were also found to be less responsive to psychosocial concerns raised by the elderly.

Studies affirm that physicians' negative attitudes toward the elderly are fostered by their involvement with only the sick and debilitated elderly (Adelman and Albert, 1987; Linn and Zeppa, 1987).

Physicians' Perceptions of Alcoholics

Straus (1976) points out that we have not come very far in reducing the negative attitudes of health professionals toward alcoholics. He attributes this, in part, to the concept of "derived stigma." If health professionals become identified with alcoholics, they fear they will become labeled and lose favor with other patients (or peers). Therefore, professionals are reluctant to risk acquiring the lower status of their patients, inhibiting the development of positive professional attitudes toward alcoholics.

The sparse literature on physicians' perceptions of alcoholics reveals very strong agreement that physicians hold negative views of the alcoholic. Jones and Helrich (1972) found that 7 out of 10 physicians agreed that alcoholics were uncooperative and difficult patients. Cantor (1977) found that physicians thought time, effort, and money spent to achieve an accurate medical diagnosis were not worthwhile because alcoholics rarely followed
recommendations. House staff felt that treatment of alcoholic patients was not part of their primary responsibility because there were treatment programs designed specifically for the alcoholic.

Jeffery (1979) found that alcoholics without other readily identifiable health problems were considered "rubbish" by physicians. Alcoholics were less deserving of medical attention than patients who were "good" or "interesting"—those cases which helped physicians to further their professional careers. Alcoholics were viewed as responsible for their own drinking problems and as likely to refuse to cooperate with medical recommendations.

Riley and Marden (1946) found in a survey that 43 percent of physicians reported that alcoholics did not cooperate with medical treatment, while 28 percent reported that alcoholics caused specific annoyances and were a nuisance. Only 5 percent of the physicians reported that alcoholics created no special problems. Not much has changed over time in physicians’ perceptions of alcoholics.

Another issue is that physicians may not discuss a drinking problem because they do not recognize that alcohol is a problem. Consequently, alcohol problems often are missed by physicians who lack training on alcoholism and the desire to treat alcoholic patients. This is especially true with elderly patients. If alcoholics are seen as unpleasant to deal with, it is no surprise that physicians avoid the issue. Mullin (1978) notes that physicians are likely to avoid discussions of drinking behavior with patients because it is uncomfortable for them. Lukash (1979) reports that physicians’ unwillingness to confront patients about a drinking problem is the most critical issue in treating alcoholic patients.

The more recent literature reaffirms that discomfort in identifying and treating alcohol problems can result in physicians having a very narrow definition of alcoholism, which often excludes the elderly. Moore, et al. (1989) found that patients identified as alcoholic by physicians were significantly more likely to be younger, male, nonwhite patients of low socioeconomic status who admitted to relatively heavy alcohol intake.

Research Setting

No interview studies which examined physicians’ perceptions of elderly alcoholics were located in the literature. Therefore, an exploratory study was carried out to assess physicians’ perceptions of elderly alcoholics, with special attention to whether physicians were less responsive to the drinking problems of the elderly than they were to the drinking problems of younger patients.
The study involved semi-structured interviews with physicians in a resort/retirement community in the Northeast. All physicians (n=26) who treated elderly patients were included in the study. Due to revisions in the interview guide, four interviews were not comparable and were excluded from some analysis.

The exploratory study revealed that medical school training was minimal, at best, for the 26 physicians. Six received no training at all on alcoholism. Twenty received some training, usually limited to a few hours. Only one physician in 26 received any information on the drinking problems of the elderly while in medical school. Length of time out of medical school (2 to 35 years) was not related to training on alcoholism. The physicians also revealed their lack of interest in alcoholism, in that only 4 stated that medical schools should be doing more training on alcoholism.

Results

General Attitudes

Twenty-two physicians in this exploratory study were asked whether alcoholic patients created special difficulties for physicians. All 22 responded that alcoholics did create problems for them. One physician referred to alcoholics as “obnoxious dirt balls.” Another physician stated:

They lie. They’re unreliable, don’t show up for appointments, don’t take medications, don’t follow advice. They’re irresponsible, demanding. They call in the night.... You spend thousands of dollars, stay up all night, give time, effort, and money. They have no insurance. It’s unsatisfying. They go right back to drinking.

Many other physicians were similarly strong in their negative characterizations of alcoholics.

Physicians were asked specifically whether elderly alcoholic patients created any special problems for them. Several physicians commented that elderly alcoholics had more severe medical problems than younger alcoholics. Many physicians appeared to avoid giving a direct response to the question by talking about something else, reaffirming that they may have little knowledge of, or experience with, elderly alcoholics.

One issue under study was the tendency of physicians to ask elderly patients about drinking behavior less often than they ask younger patients. One physician acknowledged this to be the case: “There is some subconscious tendency to not ask the little old lady with apple pie. You don’t ask her about cocaine.”
Even if there was evidence of a drinking problem, physicians were less likely to intervene with the elderly patient. One internist reported that he was much less likely to intervene with the elderly patient "...unless there is indisputable evidence. I feel I'm being disrespectful." It appears that respect for the elderly patient can take precedence over health issues which involve alcohol.

Physicians revealed that they considered it less important to know if an elderly patient had a drinking problem than if a young patient had the same problem. A cardiologist had this to say about the elderly alcoholic:

I'd be working against bias. They'd be harder to change. The bias is that it is less important to do so because of age. The elderly person who is having seven to eight drinks a day.... The doctor will tolerate this and is less likely to force the elderly to stop drinking. There is much more concern for the 45-year-old if he is having seven to eight drinks a day.... They've [the elderly] done it this long. They deserve what comes. I don't believe it won't hurt. I know this is a value judgment. It's not worth my effort.

These comments reveal that physicians have less knowledge of drinking problems among the elderly and consider it less important to intervene with the elderly.

Vignettes

The vignettes were designed to compare physicians' treatment strategies for elderly and younger alcoholic patients. The intent was to collect more detailed data on how physicians interpreted and acted on their patients' alcohol problems and to determine whether physicians' recommendations were based on age.

Twenty-two physicians were presented with two vignettes at the end of the interview. The first vignette described a 76-year-old widower admitted to the hospital after he came to the hospital emergency room smelling of alcohol and voicing complaints of severe abdominal pain, vomiting, and diarrhea. A medical workup revealed a diagnosis of cirrhosis of the liver. The physicians were asked the question: "How do you handle this situation?" After the physicians responded, the interviewer asked them to respond to a second vignette which described the exact same scenario, except that the patient was a 44-year-old male.

Physicians' responses about treatment fell into 3 major categories: 1) referral to an inpatient alcoholism treatment program; 2) referral to the hos-
pital alcoholism counselor, who talks with patients during their hospital stay; and 3) no recommendation for any treatment for the alcoholism. Table 2 depicts the treatment options recommended for the 2 patients.

The results of the study reveal that the younger patient would more often be offered treatment for alcoholism (100 percent vs. 64 percent) and would receive the recommendation for more intensive inpatient alcoholism treatment than the elderly patient (68 percent vs. 14 percent). A referral to the alcoholism counselor represents the opportunity for the patient to talk about the drinking problem. This was recommended more often for the elderly patient (50 percent vs. 32 percent), and represented an intermediate level of intervention. Although no physician indicated that the alcohol problem of the younger patient would be ignored, over one-third (36 percent) of the physicians reported that the drinking problem of the elderly patient would not result in a recommendation for any treatment.

Only 5 physicians would have had the same level of intervention with both the elderly and the younger patients. These 5 physicians all said that they would refer both patients to the alcoholism counselor.

Many of the 22 physicians acknowledged that they would not offer the same interventions to both patients and that age was the determining factor as to how much intervention was provided. Only one physician indicated that he would give the elderly patient more attention than the younger patient, by being “more coaxing and supportive,” as this physician felt that the elderly patient would be more likely to return to him for follow-up care.

The vast majority of the physicians acknowledged a lower level of intervention with the elderly patient. Almost all of this group would recommend that the younger patient receive some type of treatment—a talk with the hospital alcoholism counselor, Alcoholics Anonymous, or an inpatient alcoholism rehabilitation program. This was not the case for the 76-year-old; 8 physicians would not offer any treatment at all for the alcohol problem.

Several physicians stated that they would be more “confrontive” with the younger patient. In revealing that he would recommend inpatient treatment

Table 2
Vignette Options Recommended by Physicians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physician Recommendation</th>
<th>76-Year-Old</th>
<th>44-Year-Old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Treatment</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>15 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholism Counselor</td>
<td>11 (50%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td>8 (36%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22 (100%)</td>
<td>22 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for the 44-year-old but not for the 76-year-old, one physician stated: “I’m not sure of the rationale. More chance for success. The [younger] person is more receptive. The younger person has more long term risk due to drinking.”

A typical response showed more optimism for the younger patient: “He has good years ahead and is more likely to have a reversible problem.” The physician would try to get him into Alcoholics Anonymous and might encourage him to enter the local inpatient alcoholism rehabilitation program. For the elderly patient, this same internist saw loneliness as a big factor and said he would help the 76-year-old by “trying to introduce him to a nice widow”—a clear indication that the drinking problem was not taken too seriously.

Regardless of the treatment recommendations made to the patients, these physicians acknowledged that they would make a greater effort to get the younger patients to accept their recommendations. One physician said that he would “push harder” with the younger patient to get him to accept help. His rationale was that the younger patient has more life span and “...more productive life ahead of him. The older person is not as rehabilitable.”

Several physicians indicated during the interview that they would treat the elderly and the younger patients the same, only to contradict themselves in the vignettes. One physician reported that he would try to get both patients, regardless of age, into an alcoholism rehabilitation program. He clearly expressed more concern about the effects of the alcoholism on the younger person, however, especially on how family members would be affected: “I’d be more aggressive. There are more lives at stake. The younger person presents more of a social emergency. He has more to live for.”

The strongest reaction to the vignettes came from a physician who had a special interest in treating patients with alcohol problems. In responding to the vignette about the elderly person, this physician outlined her efforts to encourage him to accept treatment. Regarding the vignette about the younger patient:

This is important. I have a visceral reaction. I’d be on this guy right away. Get in touch with his girlfriend. I’d be all over him like a bad smell. I have a real visceral response. The only difference is a number [age]. You have to be discreet with the elderly. You’re not quite as aggressive and hopeful. I got it right here in my gut. There is a difference.

This physician, like many other physicians, had not previously considered whether her interventions with alcoholics were based on the patient’s age.
She assumed she would treat both the same and was surprised to learn that she would make a greater effort to engage the younger person in treatment.

In sum, the vignettes revealed that the vast majority of physicians would be more concerned, more active, and more aggressive with the younger patient with a drinking problem. They saw the younger patient as more worthy of their efforts and the efforts of other professionals. The age factor could indeed determine the level of involvement physicians have with patients with drinking problems. Even the few physicians who had a special interest in treating alcoholic patients revealed the likelihood of greater intervention with the younger patient.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The literature and the exploratory study reaffirm that most physicians have little knowledge of or interest in the drinking problems of their patients. Medical school training fails to give physicians the message that interventions in patients' drinking problems are a physician's responsibility. Medical school training on alcoholism has been restricted to specific isolated programs in a few medical schools (Chappel et al., 1977). Murphy (1980) notes that none of the interviewed physicians said they had learned anything useful about alcohol problems in medical school. A survey by the American Medical Association in 1984 revealed that 86 percent of physicians reported that lack of training in medical school was the most important reason for lack of confidence in diagnosing and treating alcohol problems (Cotter and Callahan, 1987). Importantly, Chodorkoff (1967) and Chappel, et al. (1977) found that medical students who did receive training in alcoholism developed more positive attitudes toward alcoholics and their recovery.

Unfortunately, medical education on alcohol problems appears to be on the decline. In the 1970s, the federal government sponsored the Career Teacher Program designed to implement alcohol education in 50 medical schools. The program ended in 1981 (Medical Education Still Needs Attention, 1989).

It would be very appropriate and easy to conclude with the recommendation that physicians should receive more training in medical school on alcoholism. Also, physicians' attendance at educational programs addressing patients' drinking problems should be required for medical licensure. However, the fact that there has been little interest in the 35 years since the American Medical Association designated alcoholism as a disease makes it seem unlikely that physician interest will increase without concerted efforts. Physician time and energy are increasingly consumed by keeping abreast of the latest technological developments, concern over managed
health care systems, and coming to grips with new demands, such as the AIDS epidemic.

The attitudes of physicians toward alcoholics in general, and elderly alcoholics in particular, are certainly worthy of more research attention. Physicians' attitudes toward alcoholics should be compared with attitudes toward patients with other types of illness, such as diabetes and heart disease. Are physicians' interventions also based upon the patient's age in these cases?

Since it appears unlikely that physicians will show a greater interest in uncovering and treating drinking problems in the current circumstances, it is appropriate to explore new strategies to address the drinking problems of the elderly. One strategy worth considering is for physicians to routinely administer to new patients an objective questionnaire, such as the Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test [MAST] (Selzer, 1971) or its short revised version, the SMAST (Selzer, et al., 1975) to quickly, easily, and reliably assess whether a patient has a drinking problem (Moore, 1971; Westermeyer, et al., 1978). The use of these tests would reduce the awkwardness both physician and patient can feel in a discussion of alcohol consumption. An alternative is Lukash's (1979) recommendation to administer blood alcohol tests as a standard laboratory test for every patient admitted to a hospital.

Yet another strategy would be to train other professionals who work closely with physicians, such as nurses and social workers, in the assessment of drinking problems. Mental health professionals would be excellent candidates for training, as they are likely to already have some knowledge of the community alcoholism treatment services. Emergency room physicians and nurses could utilize specialized training, as staff very often treat patients with alcohol problems. Yet another possibility would be for alcoholism professionals to become part of the hospital staff and to serve in a consulting role to physicians and other professionals.

Still another strategy emphasizes training with community agencies that offer services to the elderly, such as Visiting Nurse agencies, Meals on Wheels programs, and homemaker agencies. Agency staff would benefit from training in how to assess elderly clients for alcohol problems and how to refer the clients to resources available to treat elderly alcoholism.

All of these alternatives seem plausible and deserve further research.
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