



Why We Should Care about Older Adults Susceptibility to Phishing

Daniela Oliveira



Florida Institute for Cyber Security











Census Bureau

actual through 2010; projections through 2050

4













Cognitive change across adulthood



Agarwal et al., 2009; Samanez-Larkin & Knutson, 2015













Authority Scarcity Commitment/Consistency Liking Reciprocation Social Proof

Participants - 158

	Young Participants	Older Participants
Ν	99	59
% female	55.6	44.1
Age	21.57 (3.80)	70.98 (8.30)
Years of Education	14.24 (3.57)	16.30 (2.79)
Hrs of Exercise per week	5.40 (3.43)	8.84 (10.50)
Physical Health	7.72 (1.54)	7.53 (1.97)
Mental Health	8.00 (1.52)	8.57 (1.50)
Hrs on Internet per week	7.35 (2.90)	7.09 (2.98)

Note. **Bold** indicates significant age differences at p < .05.



Dear Daniela,

Our resources have indicated that you have a parking violation from 12/17/2015 at SW 89th Avenue, in Gainesville FL at 3:34pm. Please go to our website to obtain more information about the violation and to pay your fine or refute your ticket: < link omitted > Sincerely,

Susan Smith Alachua County Traffic Correspondence 2345 Main Street Gainesville, FL 352 344 5656

Authority + Legal

Older adults more susceptible than younger adults into falling for a phishing email

Huge effect for older women: the most susceptible group

(p < 0.001)



Age x Gender Effect



Note. Age x sex: *B* = 1.10, *z* = 2.30, *p* = .02

Age x Gender Effect



Note. Age x sex: *B* = 1.10, *z* = 2.30, *p* = .02

Weapon of Influence x Susceptibility



Young Participants
Older Participants

Life Domains x Susceptibility



Low Susceptibility Awareness, Particularly Among Older Users and Those with Lower Cognitive Status

How likely would you click on the link in this email?



Note. Age main effect: p = .08

Note. Delayed Memory Recall: *B* = .163, *R*² = .317, *p* = .002

Oliveira, Ebner, et al., 2017, CHI



Deception





WITH GOTTFRIED DILDEI BY SHEILA BOOTH









Thank you!

daniela@ece.ufl.edu